

# FAITH-BASED PERSPECTIVES ON THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE,  
DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES  
OF THE

COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENT REFORM  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 23, 2004

**Serial No. 108-158**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/congress/house>  
<http://www.house.gov/reform>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

94-492 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2004

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

## COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

TOM DAVIS, Virginia, *Chairman*

DAN BURTON, Indiana	HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	TOM LANTOS, California
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida	PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio	ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DOUG OSE, California	DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
RON LEWIS, Kentucky	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania	WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
CHRIS CANNON, Utah	DIANE E. WATSON, California
ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, Virginia	CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee	LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
JOHN SULLIVAN, Oklahoma	C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
NATHAN DEAL, Georgia	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
TIM MURPHY, Pennsylvania	CHRIS BELL, Texas
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas	
MARSHA BLACKBURN, Tennessee	BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

MELISSA WOJCIAK, *Staff Director*

DAVID MARIN, *Deputy Staff Director/Communications Director*

ROB BORDEN, *Parliamentarian*

TERESA AUSTIN, *Chief Clerk*

PHIL BARNETT, *Minority Chief of Staff/Chief Counsel*

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES

MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana, *Chairman*

NATHAN DEAL, Georgia	ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN L. MICA, Florida	WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
DOUG OSE, California	LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, Virginia	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas	CHRIS BELL, Texas
MARSHA BLACKBURN, Tennessee	

## EX OFFICIO

TOM DAVIS, Virginia

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

J. MARC WHEAT, *Staff Director*

ELIZABETH MEYER, *Professional Staff Member*

NICOLE GARRETT, *Clerk*

## CONTENTS

---

Hearing held on January 23, 2004 .....	Page 1
Statement of:	
Anderson, Ed, vice president/CFO, Compassion International .....	75
Cote, Bob, Step 13, Denver, CO .....	86
Cowles, Reverend Dean, president, YouthPartnersNet .....	59
Haley, Mike, manager of gender issues, Focus on the Family .....	24
Jaramillo, Jackie, Faith Partners .....	84
Keller, Frank, senior director of constituent services, Focus on the Family .....	11
Larimore, Walter L., vice president of medical outreach, Focus on the Family .....	16
Littrell, Sharon, executive director of Interfaith Hospitality Network .....	57
Minnery, Tom, vice president of public policy, Focus on the Family .....	27
Robinson, Jean, Denver Urban Ministry .....	73
Tollefson, Dean E., Community Ministers Unlimited .....	55
Whetstone, Steven, Feed the Children .....	42
Wooten, Wilfred, senior director of counseling, Focus on the Family .....	10
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Anderson, Ed, vice president/CFO, Compassion International, prepared statement of .....	78
Cowles, Reverend Dean, president, YouthPartnersNet, prepared statement of .....	62
Haley, Mike, manager of gender issues, Focus on the Family, prepared statement of .....	25
Keller, Frank, senior director of constituent services, Focus on the Family, prepared statement of .....	14
Larimore, Walter L., vice president of medical outreach, Focus on the Family, prepared statement of .....	18
Souder, Hon. Mark E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of .....	5
Whetstone, Steven, Feed the Children, prepared statement of .....	45



## **FAITH-BASED PERSPECTIVES ON THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES**

---

**FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 2004**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND  
HUMAN RESOURCES,  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,  
*Colorado Springs, CO.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:14 a.m., at City Hall, Third Floor, 107 North Nevada Avenue, Colorado Springs, CO, Hon. Mark E. Souder (chairman of the subcommittee) Presiding.

Present: Representatives Souder and Hefley.

Staff present: Elizabeth Meyer, professional staff member and counsel; and Nicole Garrett, clerk.

Mr. SOUDER. The subcommittee will come to order. We're pleased to have Congressman Hefley, your local Congressman, here. I served under him on the National Parks Subcommittee, and I worked with him as well on many other issues, and he's been a great leader in Washington. I'm going to start with an opening statement that explains a little bit of what we're doing here today.

I thank you all for joining us today as we continue our discussion on the role of faith-based organizations in the provision of social services. I'm very pleased to be here in Colorado Springs.

Scores of dedicated men and women open their hearts and homes to the less fortunate each and every day. They do this not for the glory of public recognition or for the money but for the simple fact that their faith calls them—demands them—to action. They are committed to improving the lives of their neighbor, no matter the sacrifice to their own safety and comfort. Often their only reward, which they will tell you is the best reward, is the knowledge that they have restored hope to someone who had been suffering.

The men and women who run the countless faith-based social service organizations in neighborhoods all across the country are often the only people willing to tackle the tough problems because frequently the rest of us take an out-of-sight, out-of-mind approach to issues that make us uncomfortable.

If, in the United States, we had an unlimited amount of money, we'd be able to fund every organization that is effectively providing social services. The hard reality is that we don't have unlimited resources. So we have to find a way to get the dollars we do have into the most effective agencies in the neighborhood.

Frequently, that agency is a faith-based organization. Leaders of the many faith-based agencies I've had the privilege to visit tell me

that they are successful because they look beyond the immediate need. Their focus is helping the client regain hope and change their life.

These men and women truly make a difference, not only in the life of the client, but in the community as a whole. We need to determine how we can best encourage and support the work that they do without asking them to compromise their beliefs.

We've been having this discussion in Washington for quite some time. What I find to be most frustrating is the tendency to lose sight of the reason we are having the discussion in the first place.

We know that faith-based organizations are effectively transforming lives and communities. Where the discussion gets bogged down is in the legal questions. We need to refocus the discussion on what makes a faith-based organization successful. What is it that makes them effective?

The fact that faith-based organizations are effective is the reason this discussion began in the first place. It is time to listen to the providers tell us how we can best assist them in their work.

I doubt that government strings and bureaucratic red tape are something that they're actively seeking. I believe one of the best ways that we as legislators can help is not by giving you more government strings to deal with, but by helping to facilitate new relationships among the providers of social services and the foundations that provide financial and technical assistance to faith-based and community organizations. Today we have the great opportunity to talk with providers of a range of faith-based services. We need to understand how the unique element of faith impacts the structure and success of these programs. It is also important that we understand how your programs transform lives by building self-confidence and self-esteem. Over the last several months, we have heard from faith-based providers in San Antonio, TX; Nashville, TN; Chicago, IL; Charlotte, NC, and last week in Watson and Los Angeles, CA.

Our witnesses today represent just a small fraction of the countless faith-based organizations that are reaching out to not only the hurting in Colorado, but around the world, as well. I expect that our witnesses today will provide us with valuable insights into their work, and the needs of the community. Most importantly, they will help us identify areas and methods by which the government can best assist community organizations of all types to provide the best possible care for people in need. I very much look forward to the testimony today.

I, again, add that's the general introduction that I give for each of the hearings. I can add just a few other comments to put this in context.

The subcommittee that I chair is part of a government-formed oversight committee. We have jurisdiction primarily over narcotics, in both authorizing and oversight on narcotics and all drug policy in the United States. But we also, then, have oversight over a series of different agencies, including HSS, HUD, the Department of Education, Justice, and the Office of Faith-Based. And in that, we're the only committee that has oversight jurisdiction over the Office of Faith-Based and the White House. The actual legislation that is passed comes through other committees, as far as monitor-

ing what is going on, and trying to shape what's going on on different issues.

I wanted to do it, because I've personally been the House leader on many of the amendments that happened over the years when then-Senator Ashcroft and Coates did the first faith-based initiative in welfare reform, I think it was about 1995 or 1996.

I carried the House amendment that allowed faith-based groups to be eligible for the funding. Then as we moved future pieces of legislation through, we had more and more controversy related to it, in juvenile justice, in Head Start, in the fatherhood initiative, in HUD.

But four passed both Houses. President Clinton signed four of those into law. The latest part of the faith-based initiative would be tax reform. Compassion Capital would help to develop capacity, and the grant portion that would broaden it beyond those single and make it more permanent.

That bogged down over hiring practices predominantly. That is not the only thing. Because that is merely one thing that is related to the faith-based element where we focused on the legal issues. And we're going to finish with one in Washington where we focus on legal issues. And although it comes up in every hearing and there are disagreements on how critical hiring practices and so on, the focus here is not predominantly that.

A couple of other things. This is an oversight committee. The full committee, for example, after the Republicans took over Congress, you'll see that we have to swear in all the witnesses in this committee. There have been people prosecuted for perjury in this committee. We've done things like the Waco oversight to who hired Craig Livingstone, Whitewater, China. Most of those types of investigations in Congress occurred through this committee, because you have authorizing committees, appropriation committees, and our committee sees how it's being implemented.

That kind of gives you the context of what we're doing here. It may or may not lead to different legislation, although all of us work on different committees to support that, much of what's being done is by Executive order. Therefore, we work with that generally.

That kind of puts it in the process of this 2-year cycle. We're going to do a 2-year report, which will have information, in addition to the hearings, in it. Like we did last cycle on Homeland security. We held a series of hearings on both borders. We did this for 2 years and issued that report.

I'm on the Homeland security committee, on the border subcommittee, and Congressman Camp, who's a member of that, said this is the base and the best outline of that. We want to have a similar document for faith-based. So when people look at the national debate, while there have been a few Washington hearings as the bills have moved through, it's often only a small part of that debate. We're going to have a series of hearings on the subject.

One last comment. By House rules, you have to have either a Democrat present in a quorum, or you can get a waiver. The ranking democrat is Elijah Cummings, who heads my caucus, and we have a very good relationship. We've accommodated Democratic issues as they've moved through. We've had different hearings.

We've been able to move a number of major bills on a bipartisan basis.

Therefore, we've been given a lot of flexibility in this committee. And that's why today, you'll see there will be a fair amount of debate and discussion. Some hearings we have more of that. Some hearings there will be more witnesses from the Democratic side. We have members.

In Washington, there are fairly rigid rules as far as whether you're on the subcommittee or the full committee. And Congressman Waxman, who's the ranking member, wants us to enforce those rules. But when we go into people's districts, many of the districts have been in the Democratic districts.

But today Congressman Hefley is here. So I'll ask for a rule waiver, so that he can participate in the hearing today. He's not going to be able to be here for most of the time. But we'll have a Member from the local area.

Most of our hearings have, in fact, been bipartisan. So let me first do the two rule waivers. Written statements and questions to the hearing record and any answers to written questions provided by the witnesses also shall be included in the record without objection. So ordered.

I also ask unanimous consent that other materials referred to by Members and witnesses may be included in the hearing and that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Mark E. Souder follows:]



**Opening Statement  
Chairman Mark Souder**

**“Faith-based Perspectives on the Provision of Community  
Services”**

**Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy  
and Human Resources**

**Committee on Government Reform**

**January 23, 2004**

Good morning, and thank you all for joining us today as we continue our discussion of the role of faith-based organizations in the provision of social services. I’m very pleased to be here in Colorado Springs.

Scores of dedicated men and women open their hearts and homes to the less fortunate each and every day. They do this not for the glory of public recognition, or for the money, but for the simple fact that their faith calls them—demands of them—to action. They are committed to improving the lives of their neighbor, no matter the sacrifice to their own safety and comfort. Often their only reward, which they will tell you is the best reward, is the knowledge that they have restored hope to someone who had been suffering. The men and women who run the countless faith-based social service organizations in neighborhoods all across the country are often the

only people willing to tackle the tough problems because frequently the rest of us take an “out of sight, out of mind” approach to issues that make us uncomfortable.

If, in the United States, we had an unlimited amount of money, we’d be able to fund every organization that is effectively providing social services. The hard reality is that we don’t have unlimited resources. So we have to find a way to get the dollars we do have into the hands of them most effective agencies in the neighborhood. Frequently, that agency is a faith-based organization. Leaders of the many faith-based agencies I’ve had the privilege to visit tell me that they are successful because they look beyond the immediate need. Their focus is helping the client regain hope, and changing a life. These men and women truly make a difference not only in the life of the client, but also in the community as a whole. We need to determine how we can best encourage and support the work that they do without asking them to compromise their beliefs.

We’ve been having this discussion in Washington for quite some time. What I find to be the most frustrating is the tendency to lose sight of the reason we are having the discussion in the first place. We know that

faith-based organizations are effectively transforming lives and communities. Where the discussion gets bogged down is in the legal questions. We need to refocus the discussion on what makes a faith-based organization successful. What is it that makes them effective? The fact that faith-based organizations are effective is the reason this discussion began in the first place. It is time to listen to the providers tell us how we can best assist them in their work. I doubt think that government strings and bureaucratic red tape are something that you actively seek! I believe that one of the best ways we as legislators can help is not by giving you more government strings to deal with, but by helping to facilitate new relationships among the providers of social services and the foundations that provide financial and technical assistance to faith-based and community organizations.

Today we have the great opportunity to talk with providers of a range of faith-based services. We need to understand how the unique element of faith impacts the structure and success of these programs. It is also important that we understand how your programs transform lives by building self-confidence and self-esteem.

Over the last several months we have heard from faith-based providers in San Antonio, Texas, Nashville, Tennessee, Chicago, Illinois, Charlotte, North Carolina, and last week in Los Angeles, California.

Our witnesses today represent just a small fraction of the countless faith-based organizations that are reaching out to not only the hurting in Colorado, but around the world as well. I expect that our witnesses today will provide us with valuable insights into their work, and the needs of the community. Most importantly, they will help us identify areas and methods by which the government can best assist community organizations of all types provide the best possible care for people in need. I very much look forward to the testimony.

Mr. SOUDER. I'd now like to yield to my friend Mr. Hefley for any comments he'd like to make.

Mr. HEFLEY. Yes, Chairman Souder. I, first of all, want to welcome you to Colorado Springs. And I think you've brought this hearing to a good place, because I don't know of any community in America that has more headquarters of national faith-based organizations than right here in Colorado Springs. Everybody from Focus to Young Life, Navigators, and you could go on and on down the list.

I speak to the management group of these organizations from time to time. I've watched it over the years grow, and I think the last time I spoke to them, they had over 100 organizations represented. And so you come. We appreciate you coming here, and thank you for it.

And this is an important topic. Somewhere down the line, we've gotten the idea that government has to do it all. And for most of our country's history, that has not been the case. For most of the history of the United States, who do you think did the social services to this country? It was the faith-based organizations.

It was only during the Great Depression that we began to get the growth of the Federal Government being involved in all of these services to the point now that you bring up something like this, and there are those in Washington who think somehow or another if it's a faith-based organization, it will contaminate the system. But, oh, the government could sure do it right.

We've seen over the years that the government has not done it right in many, many cases and the government cannot do it all. We need help. And we need help from people who are dedicated and committed and know how to do it. And the movement to enlist faith-based organizations has been a priority of President Bush, and I think it should be a priority of all of us.

The question is how do you do it and get past the legal hurdles that you've talked about? So I look forward to the hearing today, and appreciate you bringing the hearing to Colorado Springs.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much.

As long as I look east, it looks a lot like Indiana.

For the record, too, if there are people who want to provide information to the committee or submit statements who aren't on the panels, if you'd provide them to us, we'll try to get them into the written record. But only witnesses who have been on the schedule and have been cleared with the committee are going to be testifying publicly today.

Now, if the first panel will come forth to the panel. Will you raise your right hands.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let the record show that each of the witnesses responded in the affirmative. The clock will show green at 5 minutes with 1 minute to go. It should show—do we have yellow on this one? If there's time after your 5 minute testimonies each, and we have a large second panel, as well, we'll ask questions.

As you heard in the earlier part, your full testimony will be submitted in the record. You can submit other things after that. You can either read or summarize your statements, and I'll be a little generous with the 5 minutes. But with the pressures, we really

want to get into some of the questions and some reaction of what is said. So we'll start with Mr. Wilfred Wooten from Focus on the Family.

**STATEMENT OF WILFRED WOOTEN, SENIOR DIRECTOR OF  
COUNSELING, FOCUS ON THE FAMILY**

Mr. WOOTEN. Thank you, sir. In the book, *Prayer, Faith and Healing*, subtitled, *Cure Your Body, Heal Your Mind, and Restore Your Soul*, there is a powerful thought presented by Bernie Siegel, M.D.

Dr. Siegel stated, "With prayer and faith, you can build a home for all mankind. Without them, you go build walls and fears that separate you from others and destroy your life.

When you choose to pray and love, you are in tune with your existence. Prayer, faith and love are the most powerful weapons you have, and you need to make them a consistent part of your life, and use them wisely."

Perhaps we have God. We've gotten a long way from our founding fathers, what they believed, and what they had vision for. My name is Willy Wooten. I'm a licensed marriage, family, and child counselor, and a licensed clinical social worker. I served in the armed forces as social work officer for 24 years from 1969 to 1993. I've been on the staff of Focus on the Family for over 10 years. I serve as director of the counseling department. In the last 35 plus years of clinical work, I have observed the power of faith and prayer in the healing of physical and emotional disorders. The counseling department at Focus on the Family handles approximately 1,200 calls for assistance each week, or over 60,000 per year.

These calls are the most critical needs that come into the ministry, from parenting issues, teen rebellion, divorce, separation, depression to suicide. We have 16 licensed Christian counselors, two chaplains, and a support staff of six who respond to many calls for help.

We have developed a national referral network of over 2,200 Christian counselors throughout the country to refer constituents who need additional support. We've also developed an informal network of churches to refer people who can't afford professional help or need some other kind of ministry that way.

I have worked in a variety of secular and faith-based settings. Both research and my observation are that faith, prayer, and hope make a significant difference to the health, well-being, and healing of those who are struggling with the many challenges and hurdles that life can present.

I believe one critical difference between a secular and faith-based program in assisting people in need was captured in the quote I shared earlier. We in the mental and physical health professions can give only limited and temporary relief from the diseases of life in our care and services without the application of prayer, faith, and hope, the result is a viable heart change and relationship with Jesus Christ.

If you want to understand and find the solution for people's problems, one needs to go to the inventor, God, and live by his manual, the Bible. When our car pulls to the right or left instead of remain-

ing straight when we brake, we take it in for alignment. Prayer and faith is a form of alignment with God.

We appear to be out of alignment as families and as a Nation. There are court rulings that prohibit prayer in schools and other public places, thereby reducing the tools, procedures, and power our founding fathers lived by.

A comment from a constituent recently stated, "In recent months, I have very much appreciated the stand Dr. Dobson and Focus has taken on moral issues. I truly believe that it is why your ministry has done so well. You have never backed down, wavered, or filtered the truth. It's extremely hard to face our current culture, government, and justice system without at least a little apprehension about the outcome. I'm grateful that Focus on the Family has stood firm, without apology, and without watering down the stand you take on issues. Faith-based and proactive." One of the things that we do as a department and ministry is to reach out to the community here. We have contact with over 31 churches. We work with the Salvation Army. This is in reference to other faith-based organizations, American Red Cross, Northern Churches Care, Ecumenical Social Ministries, Women Partnering, Westside Cares, and others. This cooperative effort is through our benevolence outreach in helping constituents meet basic needs such as food, shelter, utilities, and medical bills, while also attending to the emotional and spiritual needs and trying to connect individuals who may be disconnected from the community at large. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Next is Mr. Frank Keller. The first panel is all from Focus, from some of the different ministries, which is one of the largest in the United States and around the world. And we wanted to see some of the range of what you do. Mr. Keller.

#### **STATEMENT OF FRANK KELLER, SENIOR DIRECTOR OF CONSTITUENT SERVICES, FOCUS ON THE FAMILY**

Mr. KELLER. Good morning. My name is Frank Keller. I've been on staff at Focus on the Family for 12 years, having previously spent 20 years in public and private school administration.

It's my privilege to be one of two senior directors for constituent services, which includes several departments consisting of 500 employees at Focus on the Family. I represent and oversee the daily activity of these departments, which provide, letter, e-mail, phone, product shipping, and guest relations services to approximately 10,000 constituents each day.

The mission of Focus on the Family states that we exist to cooperate with the Holy Spirit in disseminating the gospel of Jesus Christ to as many people as possible, and to specifically accomplish that objective by helping to preserve traditional values and the institution of the family. This, based on scriptural truths, is done through practical outreach to homes based on our firm beliefs that both the Christian faith and the importance of the family are at the center.

Each day brings several thousand letters, phone calls, and e-mails to the attention of Focus on the Family from individuals and families all across the United States. Sometimes internationally. These represent a wide variety of reasons for the contacts. Some

are sharing information that Focus might benefit from, and many are asking for advice, resource suggestions, referrals to other support organizations, or outright help in the midst of extreme personal or family hardships.

This direct communication is a vital link to the people we serve. In addition, an average of 600 guests physically walk into the Focus on the Family buildings each day looking for a tour, or are interested in shopping at the Focus bookstore and visitor's center.

Those who contact us are treated with dignity and care. The many inquiries for information, advice, and encouragement are fielded by a highly trained staff in our constituent services departments. These include phone, mail, and e-mail representatives, along with shipping and distribution personnel whose job it is to assure the highest level of personal and supportive services.

We see ourselves as entering into a relationship with those who contact us, and as a result, include offering to pray with them whenever appropriate.

Many of our constituents actually request that Focus do this for them. A foundational component of faith-based organizations is that of connecting spiritually with God through prayer, for wisdom, guidance, encouragement, and comfort. It is impossible to be a faith-based organization without being prayer-dependent.

On December 1, 2003, the highest single contact day at Focus on the Family in the last year, 24,000 phone, mail, e-mail, and Internet Web orders were received and handled by the staff. A typical or average day number of constituent contacts received and handled in the past year would be about 7,000 each day.

We feel we have been effective and successful in our attempts to assist the families as a result of seeing continued contacts and interaction for future services, as well as by the feedback we've received.

Many people write or call back to let us know how their situation or need has improved, their faith strengthened, or how their life has been positively impacted by the assistance provided by Focus on the Family.

I'd like to present three of those to you today, which wonderfully illustrate the opportunity our constituent services staff has to assist families through our faith-based organization.

First, from a gentleman serving a prison sentence, we hear these words. "Eight years ago, my marriage was in serious trouble. I was incarcerated, and didn't have any money, but I wrote you and asked for a copy of a book to help me, and you blessed me with a free copy. I'm happy to report that my wife and I just celebrated our 11th anniversary."

A woman tells us from Midlothian, VA, "Thank you very much for responding to my e-mail. It gives me a little bit of hope just knowing that even though you do not know me, you took the time to try to help me. With all my problems lately, I've wondered if God even cares anymore. But I guess he cares enough to send good people like you, who are willing to help those of you us who are lost. God bless you for giving your time to help others."

And, finally, and I'll end with this. These words come from a man in Yukon, OK. He had contacted Focus on the Family just originally just to see if he could get some information to help him



assist his disabled wife. He mentioned in passing that his financial situation was rather grim because of his wife's medical costs, and that they may have to file for bankruptcy.

He says, "In addition, and to our surprise, you sent me and my wife some financial assistance. I'm calling to express my gratitude for the way your ministry reached out to us. I did not plan to ask for assistance. But that gesture of care meant a great deal to us." Through tears he said, "You will never know what that meant to us."

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Keller follows:]

January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2004  
Congressional Hearing: Testimony of Frank Keller  
"Faith-Based Perspectives on the Provision of Community Services"

My name is Frank Keller.

I have been on staff at Focus on the Family for twelve years, having previously spent twenty years in public and private school administration.

It is my privilege to be one of two Senior Directors for Constituent Services, which includes several departments consisting of 500 employees at Focus on the Family. I represent and oversee the daily activity of these departments which provide letter, e-mail, phone, product shipping and guest relations services to approximately 10,000 constituents each day.

The Mission of Focus on the Family states that we exist to cooperate with the Holy Spirit in disseminating the Gospel of Jesus Christ to as many people as possible, and, specifically, to accomplish that objective by helping to preserve traditional values and the institution of the family. This, based on Scriptural Truths, is done through practical outreach to homes based on our firm beliefs about both the Christian faith and the importance of the family

Each day brings several thousand letters, phone calls and e-mails to the attention of Focus on the Family from individuals and families all across the United States, sometimes internationally. These represent a wide variety of reasons for the contacts. Some are sharing information that Focus might benefit from and many are asking for advice, resource suggestion, referrals to other support organizations, or outright help in the midst of extreme personal or family hardships. This direct communication is a vital link to the people we serve. In addition, an average of 600 guests physically walk in to the Focus on the Family buildings each day looking forward to a tour, or are interested in shopping at the Focus Bookstore and Visitors' Center.

Those who contact us are treated with dignity and care. The many inquiries for information, advice and encouragement are fielded by a highly trained staff in our Constituent Services Departments. These include phone, mail and e-mail Representatives, along with Shipping and Distribution personnel, whose job it is to assure the highest level of personal and supportive service each day. We see ourselves as entering into a relationship with those who contact us, and as a result, include offering to pray with them whenever appropriate. Many constituents actually request that Focus do this for them. A foundational component of faith-based organizations is that of connecting spiritually with God through prayer, for wisdom, guidance, encouragement and comfort. It is impossible to be "faith-based" without being "prayer-dependent".

On December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2003, the highest single contact day at Focus on the Family in the last year, 24,000 phone, mail, e-mail and internet web-orders were received and handled by the staff. A typical or average daily number of constituent contacts received and handled in the past year would be 7,300.

We feel we have been effective and successful in our attempts to assist families as a result of seeing continued contacts and interaction for future services, as well as by the feedback we receive. Many people write or call back to let us know how their situation or need has improved, their faith strengthened, or how their life has been positively impacted by the assistance provided by Focus on the Family. I would like to present three of these to you today, which wonderfully illustrate the opportunity our Constituent Services staff has to assist families through our faith-based organization.

From a gentleman serving a prison sentence, we hear these words: "Eight years ago, my marriage was in serious trouble. I was incarcerated and didn't have any money, but I wrote you and asked for a copy of book to help me – and you blessed me with a free copy. I am happy to report that my wife and I just celebrated our 11<sup>th</sup> anniversary."

A woman tells us from Midlothian, Virginia: "Thank you very much for responding to my e-mail. It gives me a little bit of hope just knowing that even though you do not know me, you took the time to try to help me. With all my problems lately, I have wondered if God even cares anymore. But I guess He cares enough to send good people like you who are willing to help those of us who are lost. God bless you for giving your time to help others."

Finally, and I'll end with this, these words comes from a man in Yukon, Oklahoma: He had contacted Focus on the Family originally just to see if he could get some information to help him assist his disabled wife. He mentioned in passing that their financial situation was rather grim because of his wife's medical costs, and that they may have to file for bankruptcy. He says: "In addition, and to our surprise, you sent me and my wife some financial assistance! I'm calling to express my gratitude for the way your ministry reached out to us. I did not plan to ask for assistance, but that gesture of care meant a great deal to us." Through tears, he said, "You will never know what that meant to us."

Mr. SOUDER. Our third witness is Dr. Walter Larimore, vice president of medical authorization.

**STATEMENT OF WALTER L. LARIMORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF  
MEDICAL OUTREACH, FOCUS ON THE FAMILY**

Mr. LARIMORE. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hefley, good morning. Prior to joining Focus on the Family to become the vice president of medical outreach, I practiced family medicine for over 20 years. I was also involved in medical research and writing and appointments, including the University of Colorado.

My testimony today to you is as a physician and researcher, and it's on the topic of the impact that positive spirituality can have on individuals and upon society.

Positive spirituality, as I and my research colleagues have defined it in the medical literature, is distinctive from faith, morality, and religion, in that it involves an ever evolving authentic and personal relationship with God.

It's not bound by race, ethnicity, economics or class. This personal relationship with God promotes the wellness and welfare of others over self. It includes the beliefs and values by which an individual lives, and it results in the visible fruit of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control.

Over the last 40 years, researchers have increasingly shown that those with positive spirituality, those who internalize biblical teaching by frequently praying, applying what the Bible says to their lives, and believing that they will have a personal relationship with God, and practicing what they teach or believe have high levels of satisfaction in life, high levels of a sense of well-being, and overall happiness.

The Handbook of Religion and Health published by Oxford Press said that the published data suggested, religious commitment plays a significant, beneficial role in three ways. One, in the prevention of mental and physical illness; two, improving how people cope with mental and physical illness; and three, facilitating recovery from illness.

Representative Souder, if we had a pill that would do that, it would outsell Viagra. Not by much, but it would.

Positive spirituality postpones the development of physical disability in later life. It helps chronically ill people who think of themselves and perceive themselves as less disabled than they really are. Positive spirituality results in optimism, hope, purpose, and meaning, even in the midst of negative life circumstances. Persons with positive spirituality can experience peace and healing, even when a cure is not forthcoming.

Relationships between mental health and strong faith, devout prayer, and religious socialization have consequences that are far-reaching, and perhaps greatly underestimated.

Positive spirituality is associated with improved attendance at scheduled medical appointments, greater cooperativeness with medical treatment plan, better compliance with medical recommendations, and improved medical outcomes. Positive spirituality is associated with decreased divorce, decreased fatherlessness, decreased teen pregnancy, decreased criminal recidivism.

Let me close my testimony with just three suggestions on how the facilitation of faith-based organizations in healthcare may be beneficial to individuals and societies.

No. 1 would be to encourage healthcare organizations and caregivers to incorporate positive spirituality into clinical care.

Over the last several years, we've been involved in a continuing medical education course for healthcare providers. Over 10,000 healthcare providers have attended this course, either through live conference or video conference. Most of the learners were primary care physicians who were anxious to learn how to incorporate positive spirituality into their practices. The promotion of such faith-based activity by healthcare givers only improves doctor-patient relationships, and it introduces the very positive faith factor in physical well-being.

Second, encourage education in the proper implementation of the HIPAA regulations, so as not to prevent patients from receiving the positive spiritual care they desire and need.

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 includes language originally intended to prevent electronic patient information from being sold and used inappropriately. But it's tied the hands of the healthcare industry in knots, and it's prompted most providers to err on the side of zero access to patient data.

We're hearing from many pastoral professionals around the country that it means they can no longer stop by a hospital in search of members of their congregation without having permission or being on a specific list.

It's been contended that these bureaucratic snafus could be readily fixed by the Department of Health and Human Services with a clarification of the privacy rules and the intent of HIPAA.

Last, we would ask Congress to consider continuing and expanding clinical pastoral education. On October 1, 2003, the Medicare funding of CPE programs was diminished. And we feel that may have a negative implication on the positive spiritual care of people in hospitals.

Let me conclude my comments to you by saying that the evidence today tells us that clinicians, communities, and Congress should continue to encourage positive spirituality. Health policymakers, health-care givers, and faith-based organizations should assess the spiritual needs of people and provide indicated and desired spiritual interventions.

Our social programs should not, without compelling data to the contrary, deprive people of the spiritual support and comfort upon which their hope, health, and well-being may hinge. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Larimore follows:]

# **HB 1022 – Abortion Clinic Regulations Bill for Colorado**

Testimony of Walter L. Larimore, MD

- Medically, a surgical abortion is an invasive surgical procedure. As an invasive surgical procedure, surgical abortion differs significantly from minor gynecological practices and therefore warrants a higher medical scrutiny and accountability than other procedures regularly performed in a doctor's office or a freestanding medical clinic.
- For example, a D&C (Dilation of the cervix [the opening of the uterus] and Curettage [or removal of the lining of the uterus] for diagnostic purposes) is an invasive surgical procedure—which is similar to the suction D&C that is used in most first-trimester pregnancies (12 weeks or less). Yet, the diagnostic D&C, which generally has fewer complications than a surgical abortion, is usually *not* performed in doctor's offices—but in facilities with more equipment and the ability to handle surgical emergencies—such as ambulatory surgical centers.
- Although surgical abortions could be performed in doctors' offices in Colorado, my questioning of family physician and obstetrician-gynecologists around Colorado leads me to believe the vast majority of surgical abortions are *not* performed in doctors' offices, or even ambulatory surgical centers. This is certainly true across the US, where surgical abortions are most commonly provided in free standing clinics in which surgical abortions are a major, if not the major service provided.<sup>1</sup>
- For nearly all invasive surgical procedures, the surgeon performing the procedure cares for the patient both before and after the procedure—providing 24-hour availability to their patients.
- Yet, the vast majority of first- and second-trimester abortions in the US are performed in outpatient medical clinics by doctors that have not seen, nor will see in follow-up, most of the women they abort.
- According to Emergency Room Physician, Dr. Leorna Burton, "Abortion is one of the most frequently performed surgical procedures in the United States—yet it is the least regulated. It is the only elective surgical procedure that I know of in which the doctor performing the procedure is not responsible for follow-up care, nor does he or she take an active role in dealing with the complications. Not only this, but the very nature of abortion clinics, which practice in isolation from the rest of the medical community, keeps the abortion provider free from accountability for these complications."<sup>2</sup>
- Unfortunately, this type of practice does not meet published national standards<sup>3</sup>—not even standards published by Planned Parenthood.<sup>4</sup>
- In my experience, most of the complications of abortion are cared for by family physicians, obstetricians, gynecologists and emergency room physicians. As I will discuss in a moment, it is likely that most of these physicians are not even aware they are dealing with the complications of an abortion.

<sup>1</sup> Morris Wortman, MD, Rachel Plotinsky, BS. Elective Abortion Complications: Avoidance and Management. *The Female Patient* 1998;23:11-27.

<sup>2</sup> Lenora W. Berning, M.D. Abortionists Are Not Held Accountable for Mistakes. *The Post-Abortion Review*, 8(2), April-June 2000. <http://www.afterabortion.org/PAR/V8/n2/berning.html>

<sup>3</sup> Morris Wortman, MD, Rachel Plotinsky, BS. Elective Abortion Complications: Avoidance and Management. *The Female Patient* 1998;23:11-27.

<sup>4</sup> Condensed Protocol Related to Abortion Services. Planned Parenthood of Central and Northern Arizona. Phoenix, AZ.

- There are many possible medical complications from a first-trimester abortion procedure utilizing vacuum or suction D&C which include, but are not limited to:
  - o blood clots accumulating in the uterus, requiring another suctioning procedure,
  - o infection or sepsis, requiring treatment by a physician or hospital admission,
  - o a tear in the cervix, which may require repair with stitches,
  - o perforation (a puncture or tear) of the wall of the uterus which may require surgical repair or hysterectomy,
  - o failed or incomplete abortion, in which tissue from the pregnancy remains in the uterus and requires the abortion to be repeated,
  - o excessive bleeding, caused by failure of the uterus to contract which may require a blood transfusion, or
  - o death.<sup>5,6</sup>
- For abortions performed in the second-trimester of pregnancy (after 12 or 13 weeks), the most common method of abortion is called dilation and evacuation (D&E). The risks of complications from D&E are generally recognized to be more common than those from a first-trimester abortion.<sup>7</sup>
- According to the most recent edition of Gabbe's Textbook of Obstetrics, "The potential for sudden, life-threatening complications is always there: perforation and intestinal or bladder injury, amniotic fluid embolism, and DIC. The D&E procedure must be approached with caution

<sup>5</sup> Gabbe: Obstetrics - Normal and Problem Pregnancies, 4th ed., 2002. Churchill Livingstone, Inc.

<sup>6</sup> Hern WM. Abortion Practice. 1990. J.B. Lippincott Company.

<sup>7</sup> Gabbe: Obstetrics - Normal and Problem Pregnancies, 4th ed., 2002. Churchill Livingstone, Inc.

and gentleness...and the patient must know that serious injury is possible."<sup>8</sup>

- According to Gabbe, the published death rates for surgical abortions vary. For suction D&C, the death rates range from 3 to 11 per thousand procedures. With D&E the rates vary from 2 to 12 per thousand.<sup>9</sup>
- Some routinely claim that a woman's risk of dying from childbirth is six, ten, or even twelve times higher than the risk of death from abortion. In contrast, others have long contended that the statistics relied upon for maternal mortality calculations have been distorted. The claim that "abortion is many times safer than childbirth" completely ignores the very high rates of other physical and psychological complications associated with abortion.<sup>10</sup>
- Now an unimpeachable study of pregnancy-associated deaths in Finland has shown that the risk of dying within a year after an abortion is several times higher than the risk of dying after miscarriage or childbirth.<sup>11</sup>
- Since Finland has socialized medical care, this study is considered very accurate and complete. The mortality rate per 100,000 cases was 27 for women who had given birth, 48 for women who had

<sup>8</sup> Gabbe: Obstetrics - Normal and Problem Pregnancies, 4th ed., 2002. Churchill Livingstone, Inc.

<sup>9</sup> Gabbe: Obstetrics - Normal and Problem Pregnancies, 4th ed., 2002. Churchill Livingstone, Inc.

<sup>10</sup> David C. Reardon, PhD. Abortion Is Four Times Deadlier Than Childbirth: New Studies Unmask High Maternal Death Rates From Abortion. *The Post-Abortion Review*, 8(2), April-June 2000. <http://www.afterabortion.org/PAR/V8/n2/finland.htm>

<sup>11</sup> Gissler, M., et al., Pregnancy-associated deaths in Finland 1987-1994 - definition problems and benefits of record linkage. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica* 1997;76:651-657.

miscarriages or ectopic pregnancies, and 101 for women who had abortions.<sup>12</sup>

- Many who support surgical abortion claim that the complication rate for abortions is low—that surgical abortion is one of the safest procedures performed in the US. Unfortunately, they are deluded. They sincerely believe they are right—but not because there are few complications. I believe it's because the complications are likely underreported.
- Surgical abortion complications are underreported because there is no accurate process in place today in Colorado to either quantify the harmful repercussions of abortion or to establish standards to prevent them.
- There are other reasons that the numbers of reported complications and deaths associated with surgical abortion are probably and artificially low:<sup>13</sup>
  - o Although abortion is legal, it still carries a stigma for those who may be injured or even killed during the procedure. This stigma reduces the likelihood that an abortion complication or death will be reported for what it is.
  - o Unfortunately, those closest to the abortion complication or death (i.e., family, personal doctor or hospital staff) may either not be aware of the abortion or desire to protect the woman who had one by not reporting this fact.
  - o Because of this, the medical record of a woman suffering a non-fatal abortion complication or the death certificate of a woman dying from an abortion complication may report the cause of death without reporting that the underlying cause was an abortion.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> David C. Reardon, PhD. The Cover-Up: Why U.S. Abortion Mortality Statistics Are Meaningless. *The Post-Abortion Review*, 8(2), April-June 2000. <http://www.afterabortion.org/PAR/V8/n2/abortiondeaths.html>.

- According to one expert, “The abortion industry has successfully kept abortion and abortionists free from the type of review, regulation, and accountability that is an integral part of the rest of the medical profession.”<sup>14</sup>
- HB 1022 would establish regulation and accountability for abortion clinics. By doing so, you may prevent or reduce complications and perhaps death.
- For example, following the death of Barbara Lee Davis from hemorrhage after a routine first-trimester abortion in Chicago, the chief of the Illinois Department of Public's Division of Hospitals and Clinics admitted to reporters, “It's unfortunate, but it's happening every day in Chicago, and you're just not hearing about it.”<sup>15</sup> Just one year later, during an investigation of only four Chicago-based abortion clinics, investigative reporters for the *Chicago-Sun Times* identified twelve abortion-related deaths that had not been reported in the state's official statistics.<sup>16</sup>
- In the late 1980's, Kevin Sherlock, an investigative reporter who specializes in public document searches, undertook an extensive review of death certificates for women of reproductive age in Los Angeles County. Looking for indications of “therapeutic misadventure,” he pulled autopsy reports and was able to find 29 abortion-related deaths in L.A. County alone between 1970 and 1987. Four of these deaths occurred during a one-year

<sup>14</sup> Lenora W. Berning, M.D. Abortionists Are Not Held Accountable for Mistakes. *The Post-Abortion Review*, 8(2), April-June 2000. <http://www.afterabortion.org/PAR/V8/n2/berning.html>

<sup>15</sup> Ann Saltenberger, *Every Woman Has a Right to Know the Dangers of Legal Abortion*. Glassboro, NJ: Air-Plus Enterprises, 1982:27.

<sup>16</sup> Pamela Zekman and Pamela Warrick, “The Abortion Profiteers,” *Chicago Sun-Times*, special reprint 3. December 1978 (original publication 12 November, 1978).



period for which the CDC reported zero abortion-related deaths for the entire state of California and only 12 deaths for the whole country.<sup>17</sup>

- Using a similar technique, Sherlock eventually documented 30 to 40 percent more abortion-related deaths throughout the country than have been reported in the “official” national statistics published by the CDC. Furthermore, Sherlock accomplished this without any assistance from the CDC, which obstructed his every effort to examine their records. Sherlock admits—and even insists—that with his limited resources and the tendency of abortionists and state health authorities to minimize or obscure the paper trail surrounding abortion-related deaths, he has documented only a fraction of the deaths that are actually occurring as a direct result of abortion.<sup>18</sup>
- There is no doubt that abortion is a divisive issue; yet one thing we all can agree upon is that the health and welfare of women seeking abortions should be protected and a priority.
- Unfortunately, experiences in other states cast a long shadow that lingers here in Colorado. The over two dozen deaths of women, associated with abortions that have been reported in Arizona, California, Florida, Wisconsin and New York, point to the fact that abortion is an invasive surgical procedure that carries with it significant risks and dangers.
- In his textbook on abortion procedures, Boulder abortionist Warren Hern writes, “In medical practice, there are few surgical procedures given so little attention and so

underrated in its potential hazard as abortion.”<sup>19</sup>

- As a practicing family physician, I can testify that if physicians performing abortions—whether in their offices or in free-standing clinics—and their staff are not currently meeting, or cannot make arrangements to meet the minimum requirements outlined in this bill, then this should be an area of serious concern for Colorado’s legislative, public health officials, physician associations, physicians, and all citizens.
- According to an analysis provided by the Colorado Legislative Council Staff, abortion clinics are *not* held to the same minimum state regulatory standards as are ambulatory surgical centers.<sup>20</sup> Based upon the obvious risk of complications, or even death, that such lack of regulations places on the women of Colorado who seek an abortion, this is not only unfortunate, it is potentially dangerous.
- The standards in HB 1022 are based on national abortion standards that are well supported in the medical literature.<sup>21</sup>
- The basic requirements outlined in HB 1022, as proposed, appear to be patterned after standards endorsed by national groups like Planned Parenthood and the National Abortion Federation.<sup>22</sup>
- Should the legislature pass these regulations, it may prevent future physician from experiencing cases like two horrible ones I attended:

<sup>19</sup> Hern WM. Abortion Practice. 1990. J.B. Lippincott Company:101.

<sup>20</sup> Whitney Gustin, Jim Hill. Oversight and Regulation of Providers and Facilities. Colorado Legislative Council Staff Memorandum. January 23, 2003.

<sup>21</sup> Morris Wortman, MD, Rachel Plotinsky, BS. Elective Abortion Complications: Avoidance and Management. The Female Patient 1998;23:11-27.

<sup>22</sup> Condensed Protocol Related to Abortion Services. Planned Parenthood of Central and Northern Arizona. Phoenix, AZ.

<sup>17</sup> Kevin Sherlock, *Victims of Choice*. Akron, OH: Brennyman Books, 1996:115-7.

<sup>18</sup> Kevin Sherlock, *Victims of Choice*. Akron, OH: Brennyman Books, 1996:115-7.

- Not too many years ago, I provided care for a woman who almost died from an abortion.
- Five days before I saw her, she had an abortion at an abortion clinic. When I saw her in my office, she had a very low blood pressure and an extremely tender abdomen. I rushed with her to the emergency room, where I diagnosed an ectopic pregnancy—her pregnancy was not in the womb, but in the fallopian tube.
- The ectopic pregnancy was life-threatening as it was beginning to rupture the fallopian tube. She was bleeding internally and is fortunate to have survived.
- When I got the records from the abortion clinic, I found the clinic had a pathology report that showed that there were no fetal parts—this meant that the pregnancy had not been in the uterus. Yet, there was no evidence that the report had been reviewed by a physician or that the problem was even recognized.
- In this abortion facility, like most, the woman was sent home and told to call her doctor, me, if there were any problems. Had this inadequate care been provided by any other medical provider—family physician, obstetrician, or emergency physician—it would be considered grossly negligent.
- On another evening, I received a call from our Emergency Department where a sixteen-year old woman had presented complaining of feeling short of breath, nauseated and feverish. The ER physician recommended I admit her to the hospital with the diagnosis of pneumonia.
- However, when I examined her, I found a tear in her cervix and a very tender uterus draining pus. I was certain she had had an abortion, but she denied it.
- It turned out she was septic—a bacterial infection was spreading through her entire system. This woman almost died. Only a month or so later, did she admit to me that she had indeed undergone an abortion a week or so before I admitted her.
- I called the abortion provider to report this case to him, however he never called me back. Likewise, the patient was not able to inform the abortion provider of the results of his “care.” He is still practicing, without the slightest idea that his abortion almost led to a patient’s death.
- If my patient had died, the death certificate would have likely read “overwhelming sepsis.” However, the real cause would have been her abortion.
- Abortion practitioners and their clinics that are not held to the same standards of care as the rest of the medical community may be more likely to experience complications or deaths.
- Dr. Warren Hern and his Boulder Abortion Clinic claim to follow standards that meet or exceed the minimal standards proposed in HB 1022. As such, he can claim, “...the lowest complication rates in the medical literature.”<sup>23</sup> He goes on to say, “This is not an accident. All procedures at Boulder Abortion Clinic are designed to maximize patient safety and good surgical technique.”<sup>24</sup>
- Unfortunately, those following the most up-to-date standards of care are in a distinct minority. Dr. Morris Wortman, an obstetrician-gynecologist at the University of Rochester School of Medicine, says, “In many parts of the country, protocols for first- and second-trimester abortions have not changed since 1973.”<sup>25</sup>
- The medical concerns that I have outlined this afternoon, it seems to me, warrant specific attention by the legislature

<sup>23</sup> Boulder Abortion Clinic Safety.

<http://www.drhern.com/safety.htm>.

<sup>24</sup> Boulder Abortion Clinic Safety.

<http://www.drhern.com/safety.htm>.

<sup>25</sup> Morris Wortman, MD, Rachel Plotinsky, BS. *Elective Abortion Complications: Avoidance and Management*. The Female Patient 1998;23:27.

and the state health department due to the serious nature of possible complications that can occur during or after an abortion. Dr. Wortman advises, "Women deserve the same level of technology, skill and compassion they have come to expect from other care."<sup>26</sup>

- HB 1022, as proposed, addresses medically reasonable concerns and does not propose unreasonable regulations on abortion clinics. Rather, I would be significantly concerned, as a practicing physician, if any doctor or clinic would not want to meet these minimal standards and be willing to document to objective, independent observers, that they have done so.
- HB 1022 is good legislation and would allow those who provide abortion services to document to the women of Colorado that they meet the minimum standards promulgated by the abortion industry itself.
- When it comes to regulations and standards to protect women's health, one abortion provider has wisely admitted, "Much still needs to be done."<sup>27</sup>
- With invasive outpatient surgical procedures like surgical abortions, as with outpatient conscious sedation, states and medical boards across the US have found providers and facilities are more likely to meet the standards that we inspect—as opposed to those we expect.
- I encourage you to support this good legislation and would be delighted to answer any questions you might have.

Walter L. Larimore, MD, was in the private group practice of Family Medicine for 20 years (delivering over 1500 babies), prior becoming Vice President of Medical Outreach at Focus on the Family in February 2001. He received his MD from Louisiana State University and completed his Residency in Family Medicine at Duke University Medical Center.

Dr. Larimore is a Fellow of the American Academy of Family Physicians and an active member of the AMA. He holds voluntary faculty appointments at five medical schools (University of Colorado, University of South Florida, University of Florida, University of Miami and Duke University) and is licensed to practice medicine in Florida and Colorado. He has been listed in "Distinguished Physicians of America" (1992), "The Best Doctors in America" (1998, 2002), "Who's Who in America" (2000), and "Who's Who in Medicine and Healthcare" (2002). He was awarded the "Thomas Johnson Award" by the American Academy of Family Physicians as America's Outstanding Family Practice Educator in 1996 and has been awarded the AMA's Physician Recognition Award every year since 1982.

Dr. Larimore served as a contributor to Mayo Clinic's *Complete Book of Pregnancy and Baby's First Year* and Focus on the Family's *Complete Book of Baby and Child Care*. He is the author or coauthor of several books. He has been married to his wife, Barb, for 30 years. They have two grown children and live in Monument, Colorado

---

<sup>26</sup> Morris Wortman, MD, Rachel Plotinsky, BS. Elective Abortion Complications: Avoidance and Management. *The Female Patient* 1998;23:27.

<sup>27</sup> Morris Wortman, MD, Rachel Plotinsky, BS. Elective Abortion Complications: Avoidance and Management. *The Female Patient* 1998;23:27.

Mr. SOUDER. Next, Mr. Mike Haley, the public policy gender specialist from Focus on the Family.

**STATEMENT OF MIKE HALEY, MANAGER OF GENDER ISSUES,  
FOCUS ON THE FAMILY**

Mr. HALEY. Morning. As was stated, I'm the manager of the gender issues department and the Love Won Out department at Focus.

Having lived as an active member of the gay activist community for 12 years, I offer unique insights into the causes and recovery of the homosexual condition. I serve as the chairman of the board of Exodus International, the largest ministry offering help to individuals and families throughout the world on the issue of homosexuality.

My wife, Angie and I live here in Colorado Springs, and have two sons.

Focus on the Family has taken on the difficult task of educating the populous on the true causes and recovery of homosexuality since 1998. Love Won Out has gone to the Nation's largest cities and Canada for 5 years speaking with a life-changing message to tens of thousands of people.

The Love Won Out conference seeks to balance truth and love while presenting the contentious issue of homosexuality from a Christian perspective. Attendees at our conference include parents, friends, and loved ones of homosexuals, pastors, mental health professionals, youth workers, educators, and even gay activists.

There's not a family, church, or community not personally affected by the issue of homosexuality. Pop culture says homosexuality is biological, and that change and freedom from homosexuality are impossible.

Some Christians, through fear and ignorance, communicate condemnation and hatred to homosexuals. Others don't know how to share their beliefs with those struggling with homosexuality. As a result, each year, thousands of confused and hurting people feel that there is no other option than to embrace this way of life, and thousands of families with loved ones in homosexuality feel there is nowhere to turn for help or answers.

The misleading message offered by popular culture and the church necessitate a forum of real answers to homosexuality. Love Won Out seeks to shed light on truth through the Bible and social science research. Our ministry and the hope it offers would not be possible without the power of Christ. I would not have overcome my homosexuality or now have a message of redemption and new life without Christ. Love Won Out is rooted in God's word and forgiveness through Jesus Christ, and it would not exist any other way.

Due to the dependence we have, it's imperative that we hire individuals with traditional biblical views, especially of God's design for sexuality. With so many ideas, thoughts, and beliefs on homosexuality in our culture today, we must ensure that the Love Won Out team and the entire ministry of Focus on the Family adhere to God's standards, and believe in the redemptive power of Jesus Christ. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Haley follows:]

**Testimony of Mike Haley**  
**Manager of Gender Issues, Focus on the Family**  
**“Faith-based Perspectives on the Provision of Community Services”**  
**Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources**  
**January 23, 2004**

I am the Manager of the Gender Issues Department and the Love Won Out conferences at Focus on the Family. Having lived as an active member of the gay activist community for 12 years, I offer a unique insight into the causes and recovery of the homosexual condition. I have an undergraduate degree in Christian education from Biola University and am currently pursuing a Master's degree in counseling. I serve as the Chairman of the Board of Exodus International, the largest ministry offering help to individuals and families around the world on the issue of homosexuality. My wife, Angie, and I have two sons.

Focus on the Family has taken on the difficult task of educating the populous on the true causes and recovery of homosexuality through Love Won Out conferences since 1998. Love Won Out has gone to the nation's largest cities and Canada for five years speaking with a life-changing message to tens of thousands of people. The Love Won Out conference seeks to balance truth and love while presenting the contentious issue of homosexuality from a Christian perspective. Attendees at our conference include parents, friends and loved ones of homosexuals, pastors, mental health professionals, youth workers, educators, and even gay activists.

Today there is not a family, church or community not personally affected by the issue of homosexuality. Popular culture says homosexuality is biological and that change and freedom from homosexuality are impossible. Some Christians, through fear and ignorance, communicate condemnation and hatred to homosexuals. Other don't know how to share their beliefs with those struggling with homosexuality. As a result, each year thousands of confused and hurting people feel they have no other option than to embrace this way of life, and thousands of families with a loved one in homosexuality feel there is nowhere to turn for help or answers.

The misleading messages offered by popular culture and the church necessitate a forum of real answers to homosexuality. Love Won Out seeks to shed light on truth through the Bible and social science research.

Our ministry and the hope it offers would not be possible without the power of Christ. I would not have overcome my homosexuality or now have a message of redemption and new life without Christ. Love Won Out is rooted in God's word and forgiveness through Jesus Christ – and it would not exist any other way.

Due to the dependence we have on Christ to minister, it is imperative that we hire individuals with traditional biblical views, especially of God's design for sexuality. With so many ideas, thoughts and beliefs on homosexuality in our culture today, we must insure that the Love Won Out team, and entire ministry, adhere to God's standards and believe in redemption through Jesus Christ.

Attached: **The Love Won Out Booklet Series**

- *The Roots and Causes of Female Homosexuality*
- *The Roots and Causes of Male Homosexuality*
- *Exposing the Myths and Facts About Homosexuality*
- *When a Loved One Says "I'm Gay"*
- *Teaching Captivity? How the Pro-Gay Agenda is Affecting Our Schools*
- *How Should We Respond? An Exhortation to the Church on Loving the Homosexual*

Mr. SOUDER. We'll conclude this panel with Mr. Tom Minnery, vice president of public policy at Focus.

**STATEMENT OF TOM MINNERY, VICE PRESIDENT OF PUBLIC POLICY, FOCUS ON THE FAMILY**

Mr. MINNERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm happy to be the clean-up hitter here. I hope everybody at least got on base with you.

Mr. Chairman, we fear the day when government may tell us that we can no longer hire on the basis of our religious faith. I cannot underscore enough the importance of religious conviction in all that we do at Focus on the Family.

Our work force must adhere to a Christian world view and, indeed, be alive in Christian faith in order for our ministry and the services we provide to be effective. If the government were to prohibit us from hiring with religious criteria, we would be hard-pressed to call ourselves a Christian organization.

We could not reasonably expect a religiously diverse work force, or indeed, a work force in which employees have no religion at all to carry out the unambiguous mission to disseminate the gospel of Jesus Christ. Legislative measures to ensure that our religious liberties are protected, particularly in hiring, would be most appreciated by Focus on the Family and the families we serve.

We see State to State, and it's mostly State legislation, laws being passed that make it more difficult for openly faith-based organizations, even churches in some States, to hire freely without being under the thumb of the State and sometimes local regulations, sometimes called the civil rights regulations.

We fear that will become a pall on all that is done in the name of openly expressing religious faith. It's absurd to think that a Jewish relief organization would be required to hire a Catholic believer. It's absurd to think that a Catholic organization with a devotion to the blessed virgin would be required to hire Protestants. It doesn't make any sense. Even in the faith-based initiatives emanated from Washington, we are pleased in the protections that the President has adopted to institute. But when it comes time to think about State and local regulations, and State and local laws, there is no protection offered from the Federal level against the encroachment of these local laws for those organizations that take Federal money for faith-based initiatives.

I believe that the Federal legislation has to do a lot more to protect organizations against the encroachment of these State and local laws if the organizations are going to take government money.

Let me turn real quickly to another topic. One of the goals of Focus on the Family is to encourage people to become more effective citizens by letting their voices be heard more effectively. We prize the privilege of being citizens in this great country. And we encourage our constituents to raise their voices. Much of the activity is classified by the IRS as grass-roots lobbying. Focus is permitted a yearly maximum of \$250,000 in expenditures for this activity. It's a minuscule amount for an organization with a budget of \$130 million. The current law also allows us to spend an additional \$750,000 on what the IRS calls direct lobbying. That is the

effort to relay our concerns to legislators first hand instead of through constituents.

We don't spend nearly \$750,000 for this purpose. We'd like to spend more on the grass roots portion of it. Our limit is \$1 million. There is an unwieldy distinction between grass roots and direct lobbying.

We would specifically ask that artificial distinction be eliminated. We're not asking to be able to spend more in lobbying, but simply that the unwieldy distinction between grass roots and direct lobbying be eliminated.

We join with a number of nonprofit organizations across the political spectrum in asking for Congress to clean this up. The CARE Act now before Congress would do so. A section of Senate version 303 and Section 206 of the House version, each section is called Simplification of Lobbying Expenditure Limitation, would do exactly that.

Nonprofit organizations on all sides of the spectrum would greatly appreciate Congress attending to this matter. Thank you very much.

Mr. SOUDER. Thanks.

Let me start with a couple of typical followup questions, and a few just for the general record. And maybe, Mr. Minnery, you can field the first basic question.

Focus on the Family is not affiliated with any particular church? It's a separate denomination.

Mr. MINNERY. That's correct.

Mr. SOUDER. When you have your different State initiatives, does Focus have different 501(c)3s? Do you transfer money to different 501(c)3s?

Mr. MINNERY. No, all of our expenditures are operated through our 501(c)3. Focus on the Family itself has an informal association with a number of groups on different projects and initiatives all the time.

Mr. SOUDER. So when you do a money transfer to any of those groups, it's not a possibility that you're going to get tangled up with being, in effect, part ownership or underwriting?

Mr. MINNERY. That is correct.

Mr. SOUDER. Is that true of the international operations, as well?

Mr. MINNERY. That is correct, primarily because our international affiliate organizations are their own separate corporate entities, with their own boards of directors.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you provide them with free materials?

Mr. MINNERY. We do.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me ask you one more technical followup question. On this lobbying section, as I understand the issue, it's a bias toward Washington lobbyists against non-Washington lobbyists; is that a fair characterization?

Mr. MINNERY. I don't understand it to be that.

Mr. SOUDER. You said \$750,000 for direct lobbying, and only \$250 for indirect?

Mr. MINNERY. That's correct.

Mr. SOUDER. So wouldn't that be a bias for if you have a lobbyist in Washington, and direct lobbying in Washington, then in effect



some of the lobbyists would have been affected, and it would disadvantage organizations that wouldn't have it coming directly?

Mr. MINNERY. That may well be the reason that lopsided amount is in there.

Mr. SOUDER. What local organizations are supporting this?

Mr. MINNERY. A wide variety. Too many for me to account here.

Mr. SOUDER. Then, Dr. Larimore, I wanted to make a note to my staff, and if you can followup on the two particular issues you raised toward the tail end. Because I'm worried it's going to get lost in the shuffle here. Because I'm leaving for Libya, Iraq, and Afghanistan tomorrow. So I won't be back in my office.

You mentioned two things. One, you felt that HSS could clarify, without legislature changes, the HIPAA problem. Perhaps you can either work with Mark Weiland or Roland, if you can followup with them.

The second thing is to followup on Medicare. And if you can call our office sometime next week just to make sure we're getting some of this started, and get a little more detail on the chaplain question.

Was that changed in the new Medicare bill?

Mr. LARIMORE. No, that was a revised ruling regarding Medicare and clinical pastoral education. It was published October 1, 2003. And the specifics were that Medicare reimbursement to hospitals for CPE programs was significantly altered in that only the first year of training was funded.

Mr. SOUDER. Was there a claim that legislatively there was anything to do with this, or how was it dealt with?

Mr. LARIMORE. My understanding was it was just regulatory.

Mr. SOUDER. Because we've seen this squeeze on chaplains in other areas, as well. And to the degree we can, try to get a response, because we do have oversight over HSS, and work with the authorizing committee, as well.

Let me now go back to a broad question that I thought Mr. Minnery addressed well, but I would like you to illustrate some in the different sections. And let me first start with Mr. Wooten in the counseling area.

Do you have a statement of faith for counselors? In other words, are there criterias when you have a counselor in your group, and could you kind of elaborate on how, if you didn't, how it would change your ministry?

Mr. WOOTEN. There's a statement of faith that we have as a ministry that people sign and adhere to when they are hired. How it would change the mission or our ministry.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes.

Mr. WOOTEN. The majority of people who call in crisis are looking for that particular aspect of faith that we provide. Many because they've listened to the broadcast or they've been referred by somebody else. Probably 90 percent of the calls that we get are people that have some sort of faith or are struggling with it, and maybe another 10 percent that don't.

Although we are reaching out more now with Internet, and are expecting larger numbers of people that maybe do not have faith that we want to be able to minister to. But that would very much impact our ability to freely do that.

Mr. SOUDER. It probably wouldn't be possible for you to have two counselors sitting there where if they raise a religious subject you can switch over to that counselor, and if they didn't want to pray, for example, they could talk to the counselor here?

Mr. WOOTEN. In this organization, to divide up the staff between the Christian and secular—

Mr. SOUDER. You'd almost have to divide it by phone conversation. In the middle of the phone conversation.

Mr. WOOTEN. Yeah.

Mr. SOUDER. In other words, for those who argue that you don't have to necessarily pray, or you don't necessarily have to give a statement of faith, my impression is that would be very difficult in a mission like yours to separate the kind of work side of Christianity from the faith side of Christianity in the same conversation.

You couldn't say, "Uh-oh, this is yours." You'd have to tag-team the phone call.

Mr. WOOTEN. Absolutely. We don't force anybody. We offer to pray with somebody, because we feel that's so important. And we ask them if they'd mind if we pray with them. Very few say no. If they do, then we don't, and we provide the other services of psychological and emotional support for referral. But very few don't want that to happen.

In fact, when some people call in, if they're extremely distraught, during that time of saying, "Can we pray for you?" There is a quieting that often takes place that makes whatever was said before more effective, to be able to at least summarize and share with somebody.

Mr. SOUDER. Is it fairly safe to say that doing counseling is a little bit different than, for example, giving soup at a soup kitchen?

Mr. WOOTEN. Absolutely. Yeah.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Hefley.

Mr. HEFLEY. Yes. Thank you. Tom, I'm very happy that you brought up the hiring aspect, because this is one of the sticking points in this, as you well know.

The Federal Government has a policy that they won't give grants to organizations who discriminate on the basis of race, religion, and so forth. And so this is something we have to deal with from a legal standpoint.

But you're absolutely right, what you said about the ridiculousness of the Jewish organization and Christian organization, not being able to pick people who share your basic faith, I think is extremely important. And I would not support the faith-based initiative unless this item is taken care of. I don't think you can operate.

Focus is a little different than some other organizations. And I don't know quite how you would fit into this, but I do need to ask the question. All of you pretty much, except Tom, dealt very strongly with these practical aspects of hiring and lobbying, talked about the importance of your faith and your Christian values and prayer and that kind of thing. And I agree with everything you said. I think you do a great job by using all of those techniques. But the government is not going to pay you to use those techniques, probably, in a faith-based initiative. And I use the example, and there may be someone here from the Salvation Army, I don't know. But the Salvation Army has been able over the years to bridge this gap

by saying, "Oh, yes, we have a church. And the church, we push our faith in. But we also have community service where we don't push our faith." That doesn't mean they deny their faith. But they hand out the food. They hand out the coffee to soldiers. They provide the beds for the homeless or whatever they do in terms of social service without the pushing of the faith.

And this is the reason they've been able to be part of the United Way all over the country, and on occasion get government grants for various things.

Could you and most faith-based organizations divide this? Again, not denying your faith, but not pushing it either. Not trying to disseminate Christianity in your social service aspect. Could you do that, or do you think other faith-based organizations could do that if the government did give you grants to do a certain service? Tom.

Mr. MINNERY. Well, I think Focus on the Family could not. Because the provision of services is integral to faith. It's integral to the person and work of Jesus Christ.

Just for the record, Focus on the Family has not, and the board has said we will not accept government money for the services we provide. Our funding comes from small donations of many thousands of people around the country who support the work.

And our founder, Dr. Dobson, believes that if those supporters believe that the work we're doing is no longer worthwhile, then they ought to stop sending us money, and we should go do something else. We do not want to have a stream of funding that will subject us perhaps to later strings.

Now, let me tell you, Congressman, where the problem comes in with an organization like the Salvation Army, since you brought that up. Several years ago, I believe it was, the city of San Francisco required that, in order to avoid anti-discrimination laws in the State of California, the Salvation Army must begin paying health benefits to same-sex partners of employees of the church.

Not necessarily church members themselves. But employees who may or may not be religious, who were employed by the church to hand out these services. It created great havoc within the Salvation Army, because, as you know, the Salvation Army is a church. Nonetheless, the policy was changed. The Salvation Army decided nationwide that it would comply with what the city of San Francisco had required and decided that its entire population of officers and employees would abide, and then would begin paying health benefits to same-sex partners.

There was a great upheaval in that church to the point where the policy was changed. This is how onerous even a local jurisdiction can be to a national organization doing work that everyone claims is good.

Do not allow the oppression of government to impact the relationship between a person who needs Godly help and his ability to get that. Please.

Mr. HEFLEY. Well, you're absolutely right, Tom. And this is another extremely important aspect. And a sticky issue for this legislation is that when the government gives you money to do a certain job, they usually have a lot of strings attached. And it's a matter of whether you would want to accept those strings or not or wheth-

er we can restrain ourselves from the amount of strings that we attach to it.

And I think as well as I know Focus on the Family, I agree with you that you probably do not want this kind of thing. But there are a lot of faith-based organizations out there that have an extremely good drug treatment program, for instance, or an extremely good unwed mother program or these kind of things that they're faith-based, and they're living out their faith, but they're not pushing their faith on the people that they deal with. I think if we get into a faith-based initiative, probably this is the approach that would have to be taken.

We don't want too many strings put on there either, but I'm almost sure the government is not going to grant grants to people whose main purpose is to promote their particular view of religion.

Mr. MINNERY. Congressman, Your Honor, it is possible and reasonable for a soup kitchen to have the soup paid for and the kitchen paid for by government money. Inappropriate, however, to have the evening sermon or the devotion or the religious exercise to be paid for by government money.

I don't know that any faith-based organization wants that to be the case. Separation must, can, and has, is, being made all around the country now.

The concern is that much of what is being put in place and has been put in place is by Executive order. There are not onerous strings attached now in the Bush administration, but, of course, Executive orders can change with the Executive, and strings can be placed in the future for organizations that have built up a clientele, built up an employee base on the basis that their provision of soup and blankets and bedding using Federal money will not have any interference by the Federal Government with their provision later in the evening of a religious exercise.

We're on thin ice doing this all under an Executive order.

Mr. HEFLEY. You're very right. I think we get a little carried away with the separation thing sometimes when you realize that the chamber of the House of Representatives was used as a church on Sunday for 50 years after the capital was built. It was used as a church.

Thomas Jefferson, who is considered to be one of the least religious of the founding fathers, attended that church regularly on Sunday mornings. And yet now we run in horror if there seems to be any connection at all between the two.

And it's hard to imagine. I think there have been some very bad Supreme court decisions over the years regarding this. But your testimony, at least to me, is very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

I want to go back into some more kind of specific questions before we go on. Let me make one generic statement and state one of my concerns with what's happened with the faith-based initiative.

I believed from the beginning, from the time I was with the Children and the Family Committee in the House as a Republican Senator and serving with Senator Coates, that the No. 1 part of the initiative is the tax credit or deduction part, because it reaches everybody, and we avoid this argument.

And we got so much into the debate on the government funding side that we forgot the achievable side. The most significant part, even in a compromise, is getting a foot in the door for an additional tax credit.

The second most important part, in my mind, was the capacity building. Particularly for Black and Hispanic, small neighborhood organizations who don't have CPAs and attorneys in their churches many times or on their board. And it helped them build capacity so they can go to private foundations.

As we heard at our last hearing in Los Angeles, I think it was, that the private donations in the United States, philanthropy, is greater than in all the State, local, and Federal Governments combined in social services. And if we can do more matching of those private sector groups, that we should do that.

Now, many of us believe that there is a role in Federal funds, as well. But one of the questions we often get is, "Well, why can't you just have everybody fit that definition?" Faith-based organizations have been receiving Federal funds for at least 20 years. Probably longer than that. But part of the reason when we had this discussion about Focus being on the first panel is because you don't take Federal funds, and you don't want Federal funds.

Why are you here? Because it's a chance to illustrate for the record. We had a great debate down in San Antonio between Freddie Garcia and Life Fellowship and their drug counseling, which is completely integrated with their faith, and the head of the Jewish federation or foundation there, out of Dallas or Houston, about whether or not they should be receiving any type of Federal help, even indirect. So we have that.

But I wanted to establish, again, some of the particulars. That was part of my question on the counseling. You can't really separate counseling like you can soup.

If I can ask you one other question, Mr. Wooten. I don't think you said this, but we have it in your written statement, in response to how you compare secular organizations and their delivery.

You say, "It's a difference between fast food and fine dining. Because you combine heart, mind, and body." Would you like to elaborate on that?

Mr. WOOTEN. Yes, sir. When you mentioned soup, that is basically for the body. And a lot of people can distribute that in a lot of ways. But I talked about fine dining, it really has to do with the filling out the whole person, as far as of the their emotional well-being and the spiritual aspect.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Keller, in your division, how many people do you have handling correspondence?

Mr. KELLER. It's a staff of approximately 500 staff that do the phones, mail, and e-mail.

Mr. SOUDER. And you also handle the tourists coming in.

Mr. KELLER. That's right.

Mr. SOUDER. You elaborated on people that come into Focus, that their faith can't be separated going through the visitor center. Your videos are integrated in. It would be very tough, but I guess the pizza's kind of secular. But other than that, it would be tough to secularize.

In the correspondence, how would you even conceivably separate the faith part from the nonfaith part, and how would you have a staffer who didn't understand that do the correspondence?

Mr. KELLER. Well, we couldn't. It's very consistent with what Willie said. So often the contacts that come into Focus, people are including in their conversations, "Where is God in what's happening to me?" So that supports the importance of the staff understanding that concept. And that's the faith-based, or the employee, to connect with that person. We just hear it so often that people will start a conversation that way, by saying, "Where is God?" And also, as I mentioned in my statement, more often than not, the people who contact Focus will ask for prayer. And in order to connect with that, there has to be that understanding and faith relationship connected to prayer.

Now, I will also help you to understand that the staff at Focus on the Family that I work with never do any questioning of the people who contact us: "Are you a believer in Jesus Christ?" Unless that comes up later. In order to for us to give them service, that's never a condition.

But the contact folks are the ones that will initiate that. Because Focus is known for that approach to service.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Minnery said that you depend on thousands of small donations. What would be the reaction if, in the correspondence back, there was a line saying, "God, whoever he or she may be," or something suggested that somehow you had kind of lost some certainty?

Mr. KELLER. I'm not sure I understand.

Mr. SOUDER. In other words, if you had a diversity on your staff, and didn't have the consistency, which I understand partly is what Dr. Dobson has said in the past, and you put that through both faith counseling and other counseling.

I'm not suggesting each person is totally free on their own merits to say whatever they want in the correspondence. But if somebody doesn't subscribe to that faith, and you started to see forms of contradiction to your faith, or less than both statements about your faith, do you think that would impact back in at some point into the support for the ministry.

Mr. KELLER. Are you referring to the staff?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. In other words, the standard question is, well, if you just have somebody down at the loading dock sorting through the different documents and people who are doing the mail, people who are doing the counseling, can't be they be, in effect, a non-Christian believer and still just follow your orders in getting the stuff out?

And what I'm suggesting is wouldn't this, particularly in a purely voluntary ministry, potentially have a huge impact?

Mr. WOOTEN. Can I respond to that?

Mr. SOUDER. Sure.

Mr. WOOTEN. Of all the formats of all of calls or letters that come in, about 10 percent or so come over to Frank's area, and the top 1 percent come over to counseling.

I think the critical basis is the confidence in that faith that they are calling about. That's not what we focus on. We focus on the

need that they're presenting. But if that is not appreciated or respected or shared in some way, absolutely that would get out.

And not only would it affect the donation base, it would affect the confidence that people have in the ministry as a source of help. Because people talk to other people. If you go to a restaurant and go back to the food part—maybe it's getting close to lunch. I don't know.

But if you go to a restaurant and you get food poisoning twice, and somebody asks you for a referral, are you going to refer them to that restaurant? Probably not. So there needs to be a consistency of what's presented. So does that answer your question.

Mr. SOUDER. There are different types of ministries. But one of the things that repeatedly comes up, I believe, is a lack of understanding that, at least in some conservative social support ministries, that the faith is so integral and inseparable that the proposals aren't going to work.

And in addition to government granting, I want to pursue this a little bit more across the board. Because I want to make sure it's more thoroughly aired at this hearing. For example, the media a lot of times asks, "Is Dr. Dobson a tele-vangelist or does he do social service?" He is not predominantly a tele-vangelist. He is in the delivery of services. But it's the delivery of services that are intertwined with evangelistic outreach.

So, Mr. Haley, for example, if your area, if you could not deal with moral questions, and could not deal with things that are rooted in faith, how would your ministry work?

Mr. HALEY. Well, it wouldn't. And that's one of the things that we have to look at. Even the secular social research scientist, Dr. Robert Spitzer, who was of the architects behind having homosexuality taken out of the Diagnostic Statistical Manual in 1993, who considers himself to be an atheist humanist, has seen that those individuals who have successfully attempted leave homosexuality have done better when their faith has been a part of that process.

So we see that this is just a benefit for those individuals whose lives are hurting, for them to find the added forgiveness that's found in Jesus Christ.

Mr. SOUDER. We had a Catholic activist at the Chicago hearing who works with male prostitutes on the streets in Chicago. And a Democrat colleague on the committee, Dan Davis, asked him, "Well, can't you do your ministry"—because clearly, to help these people out, they, very tragically, didn't have much money, were struggling, were at high risk of disease on the streets.

He said, "Couldn't you separate that from changing their head and their heart?" And he said, "Well, no. They'll just go right back."

Can you illustrate a little bit that challenge? Not everybody will agree with your goals or with your ministry.

But if you have those views on homosexuality and you wanted it to change, how would you do that?

Mr. HALEY. I think that's one of the things that you have to look at. I'm familiar with the ministry that I think you're talking about. John Greene with MAS Ministries in Chicago. Very dear friends of that ministry, as well.

But we can't separate, you can get people to change actions, but one of the things that we want to do is we want to change the heart. We want to go to the very core of the individual.

And what we find is that when you base something on feelings, the recidivism is very much something that we have to deal with. So if you're, again, using Willie's analogy, dealing with the body, mind, and soul, as well as their spirituality, we just see a much greater success rate occur in the lives of these individuals.

And we also are able to help the families that need to know how to balance their response to individuals in the homosexuality community. Oftentimes, the church has not known how to respond, and has further pushed the gay and lesbian population away from the very belief that we support, that those people need a savior.

Mr. MINNERY. Mr. Chairman, if I might take a crack at that, as well. I believe that the essence of Christian witness and Christian conversion in the process of struggling out of homosexuality is essential, because it inputs into someone a huge transcendent idea that, "My sexuality is being acted out not the way God wanted me to have it. Not the way I read about it in the Scripture."

And giving one's self over to the belief in God, and the belief that what God wants for him or her is what he or she should be doing, and is not what he or she is doing now in the practice of homosexuality. It's the transcendent belief in Godly wisdom and Godly power, and a belief that the practice of homosexuality is sin, and it is forgiven by conversion to Jesus Christ.

This is the essence of the power that allows somebody to begin the struggle. And it is indeed a difficult struggle, even with the power of God.

Mr. SOUDER. And when we deal with, for example, direct government grants, there's a difference between ministries that will provide shelter and assistance to someone who has AIDS or is homeless, and someone who is directly trying to transform a life.

And what we're trying to work toward is where are the different lines as to how we approach the tax part? Can you provide bussing help? Can you provide computers, but not the software? Can you provide direct help for software.

And there are lots of court decisions about this. But one of the things that we're laying out here today is that there are ministries that, quite frankly, shouldn't be applying to government, because the government is going to undermine their intentions and, quite frankly, in a very diverse society, probably wouldn't get any support for direct funding. But we have all kind of nuances in between here.

I wanted to establish that Dr. Larimore had some very interesting stats on why faith actually in spirituality can make a big difference. And I wanted to ask a couple of technical questions.

Does your data break this out, I'm trying to think. Way back in the 1980's, Dave Larson—

Mr. LARIMORE. Dave Larson.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Was one of the first researchers with this when we first raised this. And I assume there has been continuing research. I remember when we found him and got him over to HSS and Mental Health Services and started doing more grants and research with it.



Does the research show differences by types of religion. Does it show differences by commitments and faith?

Mr. LARIMORE. Dave is a good friend. We trained together at Duke. And I'm sorry we've lost him to this effort. There's very little research on the differences between denomination or different religions.

We're just seeing the beginning of that research. The vast majority, over 1,600 studies, that have looked at the relationship between physical and mental health and spiritual health have been among adherence to the Judeo-Christian traditions, particularly Christian traditions. We do find that denomination is not a particularly strong prediction of health. The researchers talk about the difference between intrinsic spirituality and religion and extrinsic spirituality and religion.

And I reference that in my written comments, along with citations that would support what I'm going to say. But the evidence is overwhelming that people who claim to have a personal relationship with God are changed from the inside out, as opposed to just attending services or having a utilitarian approach to religion or spirituality. It is the intrinsics who are the ones who benefit physically, emotionally, mentally from their spirituality. So apart from organized religion, this individual transformation appears to transform not only individuals, but families and communities.

When we look at community-based organizations and where their volunteers come from, far and away the volunteer services that are provided in this country are provided by those of intrinsic spirituality. It not only changes them internally, but it changes their actions.

So that the volunteers of even secular organizations are three times more likely to be people who have been transformed individually and spiritually.

At Focus on the Family, we believe the greatest transformation is a personal relationship with God that comes through Jesus Christ.

Mr. SOUDER. What are the statistical measures of how you get the intrinsic? Is it asking someone a sufficient measure, or would you do it by frequency of church attendance? Bible student.

Mr. LARIMORE. Good question. There's a variety of research on that. And it centers around what the researchers call spirituality assessment or spirituality history.

The research is so clear that with as few as three or four very simple questions, the position of a client or a patient can be established, that the Joint Commission for Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations began in 1996 with a quality assessment or requirement of certification that all in-patient facilities, all in-patient mental health facilities, all outpatient mental health facilities take a spirituality assessment to every client that presents there for services.

And the reason is not in any way to try to push some sort of faith upon them, but to find out where they are spiritually, and what services can be provided to them that would help them in their healing, help them in their compliance. To reduce the return rate, if you would.

We see this in drug rehab programs. Narcotics Anonymous, for example. Alcoholics Anonymous. The 12-step programs that concentrate on intrinsic spirituality. Transformation spirituality to see the highest effectiveness rates.

And in healthcare institutions, the needs of patients are massive in this area. Just as one example, there was a study that's not at all unusual. This was done at Rush Presbyterian St. Luke's medical center in Chicago, where they found that 70 percent of the med-surg patients, and 88 percent of psychiatric in-patients had at least three religious needs during their hospitalization.

And the three most common were, No. 1, a desire to speak with a chaplain or a pastoral professional during their stay. And, No. 2, an opportunity to attend a hospital worship service. And, No. 3, spiritual resource reading materials, or someone to pray with.

And that bolsters what Mr. Wooten was saying to you earlier. That those who understand this research and have been transformed by a personal relationship with God cannot separate this from quality professional activity.

And to the extent that the government would in any way impede the free exercise of that, is not only personally foreign to me, but it appears to me that the literature is clear that our society would be less healthy.

Not to establish our pushing on someone what they don't want, but to simply ask, "Is this important to you?" And if so, via referral or provision of services, we'll help you find it.

Mr. SOUDER. Obviously we're going to pursue this more long-term. Let me ask one more question, and if you don't know the answer, if we can kind of look at this. And I understand this is a difficult research question. But is there data that would show that somebody who, in other words, the obvious critique historically of religious behavior is that it's a form of screening or skimming.

One of the same arguments we hear in private schools, that those people are that way for other reasons. You genetically changed the pool. You have mother and father there. Stability of family. Higher income.

One of two ways, either freezing other variables and/or doing it this way, taking somebody who is at 40, and has one type of social problem or another, and then changes their religious beliefs. Understanding there's a potentially higher risk, because of adding a not-fair sample either, do you still see the same patterns? And are there any research studies that would suggest that?

Mr. LARIMORE. There is a huge data base, meaning that it compares populations and looks at a large variety of demographic, behavioral, and other variables, and then controls that. That's called multi-variable research.

And in those population studies, the 1,600 and some odd studies that I referred to earlier in my testimony, the vast majority of studies showed that in intrinsic spirituality, positive spirituality, transformation religion positively impacts physical, emotional, mental, and relational health and relationships. That is only in association. It is not in any way saying that there is a cause and an effect. So researchers, over the last 5 to 6 years, have gone looking in a randomized fashion. Whether it is in relationship with heart failure or breast cancer or drug treatment, looking in a randomized

fashion as to whether this makes a difference. And we have very little of that research that's been published today.

Mr. SOUDER. I want to ask one other question of Mr. Wooten, and then we'll go to Mr. Minnery for the end of my public forum.

Mr. Wooten, in your counseling, beyond the materials that you can give and the treatment you can, do you refer people to people at their local level? Do you have systems in place so that you can do that?

Mr. WOOTEN. Yeah, absolutely. That's one of the cores that we do, besides providing initial kind of supports and help counseling when they call, we provide resources to them, Whether it's books or tapes.

And I think as I mentioned in my present role, we have over 2,200 licensed Christian counselors throughout the country, and we continue to add to that we can refer in that local community.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you do similar things if somebody has physical health problems or financial needs or housing needs? Do you have any other kind of referral system or a clearing place you might send them to be able to assist them, of how might you approach that?

Mr. WOOTEN. We are not as broad that way, but we refer them to a local church or another community-based program that can be helpful to them.

Mr. SOUDER. Because one of the things I just wanted to establish for the record, when we have national/international headquarters testify, and we'll have a few others today, and we've had them in a few other places. If it's not a local agency, they're often inter-connecting, and that gets people to connect up with other faith-based ministries.

So having you start another process leads to strengthening faith-based ministries around the country. And that kind of sets up one of the things that came up in our last hearing, Dr. Keith Phillips of World Impact testified that he had 17 suggestions other than direct government funding that faith-based organizations, things we might be able to do out of the Federal Government.

Among those, and I'd be interested, not only today, but if you get some feedback, and we'll get a full list. Maybe we can get some written response from some of your network organizations.

One is, for example, we have excess military property or other government property. Could we put at the front of the list that nonprofit organizations should get first bid, if they're providing services to the poor?

Because we have a Federal disposal process for all sorts of equipment in the United States. And if somebody is working with the poor, not just faith-based, although there would be a faith-based eligibility, but why wouldn't we put them toward the front?

Another thing was similar with Federal property. Some may be from base closings and military-type establishments, others are other government buildings that move to another location. I wrote the paper on lighthouse disposal properties, and we put nonprofit groups at the front of the line.

Why couldn't something like this happen in disposal of Federal property, if you're providing services to the poor? Another that was really interesting is where we have military bases or large govern-

ment facilities and have buses. Could buses or other pieces of equipment like that, but buses is what came up here, could they provide some of those type of buses to non-profitable, chairtable groups, including faith-based, that can be used to take kids to camp from an inner city area that haven't had that access?

In other words, there are many ways to do faith-based here. And that's why it isn't necessarily direct government funding, which clearly your organization doesn't seek, want, nor should you touch. At the same time, there are a number of indirect things that your affiliates or even your organization might be able to utilize. And another one that came up was medical liability reform for low-income health clinics. In Watts, almost all of them are closing, because they can't get anybody to take the liability, and nonprofit groups won't come in and do that.

Can you comment on some of these other types of things, Mr. Minnery, and then be willing, if we provide you with a list, to kind of test some of this? Because this shows you how widespread this can be, in addition to kind of where the public debate currently is.

Mr. MINNERY. Well, certainly, Mr. Chairman. I'm trying to figure out how we would use a lighthouse if the Federal Government would give us one. I don't know that I've got an answer to that.

What immediately comes to mind is what President Bush saw in Texas when he was Governor, and that is the changed lives of the prisoners when prisoners voluntarily are allowed to join wings of prisons in which religious exercises, Bible teaching, becomes the order of the day.

I believe that the first evidence of vastly reduced recidivism are now being authenticated to show that something as little as allowing a prisoner to do one thing during the day rather than making him do something else can greatly change his future once he or she leaves prison.

So it seems to me that striking down the barriers in a Federal prison system to this kind of Bible study, religious exercise would greatly enhance the ability of prisoners to live productive lives outside of prisons. And I do not think that this would require any vast expenditure of Federal money, nor would it require significant entanglement of the government with the private sectors.

I do believe that most of these programs are being run by volunteers in prison, and certainly not prison chaplains themselves. So the prison ministry is one.

Beyond that, I'm sure that we can come up with some other ideas for the subcommittee.

Mr. SOUDER. OK. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hefley, do you have anything further?

Mr. HEFLEY. I don't think so. I think this has been very helpful. You know, Focus on the Family does a marvelous job. It reaches untold numbers of lives out there across the country, and you should keep doing what you're doing without government entanglement. And I think what you've illustrated for us here today is that there are some faith-based organizations that simply would not participate in a government program.

I take it you're not opposed to that for those who can participate in it? And let me just illustrate. I refer to Mr. Dan Ford, who formed the Ralston Purina company. He believed there were four

sides to the person. There was the spirituality, there was the physical, there was a social, and there was a mental side.

And the reason he did the checkerboard square logo is he thought people should have a balanced life. And if you over-emphasize one or the other, or you skew the square, it's not very pretty.

And what you do, it seems to me, is you deal more with the spirituality, social, and mental. And faith-based organizations that do that probably can't separate the depth of their religious belief from their service.

Those who deal primarily with the physical, that was illustrated by the soup and all of that kind of thing, probably can.

Young Life would not take their deep spiritual roots out of their normal ministry with high school kids. On the other hand, maybe they could with their ministry at the Dale House project, where they're providing services for troubled kids, and maybe they couldn't. I'm not quite sure on that.

So what you're showing me is that there are some organizations that are simply not going to be able to do this.

Mr. MINNERY. Congressman, you are correct when you say we do not oppose this for many other organizations. In fact, we are so pleased that the President has brought the power of religious faith back into the public square and made it an essential part of our national debate.

And just as soon as he formed his faith-based initiatives office in the White House, we invited one of his deputies, Don Eberly, to be a guest on Dr. Dobson's program, and explain what it is the President was trying to do.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much. Let me thank you again for your testimony. If there's anything that any of you want to add, if you'll submit that to us. I didn't go through some of our standard questions to try to make each of our hearings have some commonalities. So we may send you some written questions too.

Thank you for your time. Thank you for your years of work. The second panel will be very diverse. We've had the Sugarland people from the Houston area in the fellowship in the prisons. We had people in California from the Saddleback church, and what they're doing now in the California prisons.

So we're looking at a very diverse range of things. And it's very important to have your organization here today that helps illustrate the range of faith-based services, and how different things range, from tax coverage, hiring practices, and kind of the diversity that we face. For example, it was very important to learn on the physical and mental health centers, the plain truth is that hardcore Muslim organizations are very effective at drug abuse. It isn't unique just to Christianity when we're dealing with these kind of issues.

So I thank you very much for your testimony. We're going to take a brief recess. If the second panel could start to come forward, let me read their names in the order that we'll have you testify. We have Larry Jones, president of Feed the Children from Oklahoma City will be the first witness. Second, Dean Tollefson from Community Minister Outreaches. Third will be Sharon Littrell, Interfaith Hospitality Network. Fourth will be Reverend Dean Cowles. Fifth will be Jean Robinson from Denver Urban Ministries. Sixth will be

Mr. Ed Anderson from Compassion International. Seventh, Jackie Jaramillo, director of Faith Partners, Colorado Springs. And eighth will be Mr. Bob Cote, executive director of Step 13 from Denver.

We will stand in recess.

[Recess.]

Mr. SOUDER. The subcommittee will come back to order. If each of you will stand. If you'll raise your right hands. This committee historically asks each witness to take the oath.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let the record reflect that each witness responded in the affirmative. We certainly hope we don't have perjury questions at faith-based hearings. It's more a historical precedent of the committee. I thank you all for coming. Most of you were here during the first panel and got a general drift of how we're doing these and what we're trying to do. You have 5 minutes. You can see that we then try to save questions for a period of time after that.

Your full statement will be inserted into the record. If you want to supply additional materials, supplementary, anything that you refer to, we'll ask you for copies to put into the record too. We're going to start with Steve Whetstone from Feed the Children in Oklahoma City.

#### **STATEMENT OF STEVEN WHETSTONE, FEED THE CHILDREN**

Mr. WHETSTONE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for the privilege of being here.

Mr. SOUDER. We may have to do a mic sharing here.

Mr. WHETSTONE. Thank you, Chairman Souder, and thank you for the honor and the privilege of appearing before you here this morning. In 1979, Larry and Frances Jones founded Feed the Children while walking through the streets of Haiti. Larry Jones had been visiting some of the local churches and came face to face with the devastating effects of poverty in Haiti.

Also, he had just read an article about a surplus of 35 million metric tons of grain stored in warehouses throughout the United States at taxpayers' expense, and was struck by the stark contrast between these two mental pictures. Why couldn't things just get from point A to point B? And we were given the idea to do just that.

25 years later, Feed the Children has grown to the 19th largest charity in the United States, 10th, if you count just private funding. Through our faith, through our commitment, and through their vision, that remains the heart of our ministry.

We work through a network of more than 50,000 local food banks, churches, feeding centers, homeless shelters, rescue missions, and other organizations of faith-based and community groups in order to move that food from point A to point B. To take it from areas of surplus to where it's needed most.

While we're a Christian international relief organization, our faith plays a great role in the work that we do. Prayer is a standard part of everyday operations, as well as our long-term and strategic planning.

We were founded by faith and we operate under Biblical principles of caring for those in need with compassion and love. Our staff are professionals who recognize the fact that the things that

we accomplish are only because of the grace and provision of God. And we recognize that every day, and give him all the glory. Most people know Feed the Children for our work in disaster relief. Often we're the first trucks there on the scene to provide needed relief to families who have been victimized by flood, fire, tornados, hurricanes, and so forth. But most of what we do is to offset the greatest tragedy of all. The greatest everyday tragedy of child hunger in America.

In fact, more than 12 million children struggle with hunger every month right here in the United States. That's one in five. Government programs like TEFAP, WIC, food stamps and others go a long way to provide assistance to these families who are experiencing temporary problems. But unfortunately these programs don't go far enough.

Often many of the people who receive these benefits find they run out of assistance before they run out of month. Single moms often have to pay at least half of their take-home pay just for childcare and other necessities so that they can hold down those jobs.

And now with State facing major fiscal crises, many States have had to reduce access to these programs to those who need them most. Now, in our network of 60,000 church and other faith-based community organizations we were able to provide over 70 million pounds of food and other necessities just last year.

Additionally, we sent 14 million pounds to the same type of organizations overseas in 62 different countries. These organizations live in the heart of poverty. They know the problems. They know the communities. They know the families. They know the programs that are available, and how to access them, and they stand shoulder to shoulder with us in our efforts to accommodate those families.

We measure our accomplishments with names and faces, not just numbers. Last September, the Secretary of Agriculture, Ann Veneman, and the director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives director Jim Towey, and Feed the Children president Larry Jones announced the National Non-profit Humanitarian Initiative.

It's a nationwide program to provide nonfat dry milk to organizations like Feed the Children outside the normal scope of the TEFAP program. Last month, we distributed more than 14 million pounds to needy families across this country through organizations like the Salvation Army and others who you'll hear from today.

We have to be efficient with the resources that are provided to us. Our donors expect it. Our faith requires it. Our donors won't want to give to—they don't want to pay our utility bills. They don't want to pay our rent. They want their donations to go to move food to hungry children. And that's what we do best.

Last year, more than 88 cents of every dollar went to direct family expenditures for programs.

As much as we do, there's always more that needs to be done. We raise funds through a weekly television program and through direct mail solicitations. But these funds are used to move those trucks; 54 tractor trailers that carry food and other supplies from point A to point B.

Those trucks cost money. Fuel, insurance, licensing, and many other factors take a big bite out of what we could otherwise provide the families. And that's where we see other programs coming in.

The Denton Amendment is an overseas program that comes in when USAID declares a disaster in foreign countries. Military and other government modes of transportation can be utilized to move humanitarian aid by organizations like Feed the Children.

We would call upon Congress to replicate this program for domestic use in the United States, and not just in times of disaster, but as I said earlier in times of disaster for everyday hunger relief by American children. We'd like to see the National Nonprofit Humanitarian Initiative expanded in order to provide more food and different commodities and other government services. The bottom line is faith-based organizations have demonstrated time and again to be more efficient than large government programs. We can deliver. And with your help, we will.

Again, thank you for your leadership in this area. And we stand shoulder to shoulder with you and offer our assistance in any way to make these initiatives and others a reality.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Whetstone follows:]



**Steven Whetstone – Feed The Children  
Committee on Government Reform  
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources  
Friday, 23 January 2004 9:00 am  
Colorado Springs City Council Chambers, Colorado Springs, Colorado**

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. My name is Steve Whetstone and I am honored to represent Feed The Children at today's hearing. Thank you, Chairman Souter for your invitation and this opportunity to testify about the role of faith based organizations in addressing the needs of families across the country and around the world. I commend you for holding this hearing and for your leadership in this area.

**About Feed The Children:**

Larry and Frances Jones founded Feed The Children in 1979 after a life-changing trip to Haiti. An ordained minister, Larry was visiting local churches and saw the tremendous suffering of Haitian children. He had just read an article about a surplus of more than 35 million metric tons of surplus grain stored in government warehouses at taxpayer expense and was struck by the stark contrast of these two mental pictures. He wondered how such tremendous surplus and such devastating poverty could coexist in today's world. He clearly saw the way to first feed children, second help farmers and finally help taxpayers.

Twenty-five years later, technology, improved farming equipment and methods, more efficient markets and quality controls produce more food around the world than ever before. American farmers continue to set the global standard of agricultural efficiency. There is more than enough food in the world today for every man, woman and child to have the nourishment necessary for healthy and productive lives. And yet, more than 800 million people on earth today suffer from chronic malnutrition and another 50 million victims of natural and man-made disasters are threatened by acute hunger.<sup>1</sup>

Soon after returning to the United States, Larry and Frances Jones raised enough money to pay for the shipment of surplus wheat to churches in Haiti. Their faith, vision and commitment to serving those in need has remained the heart of Feed The Children. Our mission is simple: To deliver surplus food, medicine, clothing and other necessities to families who lack these essentials due to war, poverty or natural disaster as quickly, as efficiently and as effectively as possible.

Over the years, through faith and focus, this small relief project has grown into the 19<sup>th</sup> largest charity in the United States (10<sup>th</sup> largest based on private, non-government support.) In FY 2003, Feed The Children shipped nearly 70 million pounds of food and other essentials to authorized distribution agencies in all fifty states and the District of Columbia. Additionally, Feed The Children sent more than 14 million pounds of food and necessities to children and families in need in 62 foreign countries, providing help and hope to more than 245,000 children in the developing world.

Domestic Relief:

Feed The Children works closely with many civic-minded individuals and corporations who donate surplus food, medicine, clothing and other essentials suitable for distribution. Our trucks transport these donations to our regional warehouses in Oklahoma, Tennessee, New Jersey, California and Indiana. Some items are distributed in bulk. Others are processed into individual relief boxes weighing roughly 25 pounds. Each box typically contains canned and nonperishable food or personal care items and a small toy or book. The relief boxes are then delivered to independent agencies, many of them churches that have been pre-approved by Feed The Children. These agencies distribute these items through more than 60,000 churches, food pantries, feeding centers, homeless shelters, and other community organizations.

Feed The Children also provides emergency relief to victims of natural and man-made disasters throughout the United States including floods, wildfires, drought, tornadoes, earthquakes and hurricanes. Often, Feed The Children is the first relief agency to reach the scene thanks to our fleet of 52 tractor-trailers and network of local community partner agencies. After the terrorist attacks of September 2001, Feed The Children provided dozens of truckloads of assistance to people displaced from their jobs at hotels and restaurants by the drastic downturn of tourism in New York and Washington, D.C., focusing on families who might otherwise have slipped through the cracks of the system.

Feed The Children's Kid's School Basics program is an educational outreach program providing school supplies and personal care items in bulk to Title I schools in every state, twice every year. Each of the 225 schools selected receives enough supplies for at least 50 children.

In late fall of 2002, as more and more reservists and National Guard members were being called to active duty to be deployed with our full time military, we recognized that their families were being confronted with a new set of harsh economic realities. Feed The Children immediately began delivering food and personal care boxes to military bases across the country as a way of expressing our gratitude for the tremendous sacrifices being made by military families. This effort continues today after nearly 50 truckloads to more than 17,000 families.

#### International Relief:

In addition to providing immediate assistance in times of disaster, Feed The Children maintains long term relief and development programs in more than a dozen foreign countries. FTC International maintains field offices in Romania, Ethiopia, Kenya, Angola, Uganda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Philippines, Thailand, Japan, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras and Haiti. FTCI's core childcare programs focus on children who are disabled, orphaned, homeless or living on the streets. Sustainable development programs in local communities include water and

sanitation improvement, agricultural and vocational training, micro-finance initiatives and health and nutrition education. These programs are providing invaluable assistance in improving living conditions in many rural and slum communities. FTCI has also established Vulnerable and Abused Women Care Centers in South Africa, Honduras and the Philippines. In fact, the Philippine center recently received an award from the government for best non-governmental organization.

The Frances Jones Abandoned Baby Center, located on the outskirts of Nairobi, Kenya, measures its accomplishments by children's lives saved and made happier. The ABC provides a loving home for children abandoned or orphaned by HIV/AIDS. The center offers care, love and support to nearly 70 infants at a time. Local Kenyan families adopt many HIV-negative babies, abandoned by HIV-positive parents. FTCI also operates the Dagoretti Children's Center next door for disabled children and HIV-positive children over the age of four.

Feed The Children medical teams travel to developing countries four times each year with volunteer doctors, nurses, dentists and other support personnel. The teams perform minor surgery, treat diseases and injuries and provide needed medicine. The assistance is provided to people who cannot afford or do not have access to medical care. Last year, Feed The Children Medical Teams treated nearly 46,000 patients in medical, optical and dental clinics and dispensed more than 58,000 prescriptions for medicine and eyeglasses.

Similarly, Builders for Children provides hands-on service opportunities for individuals. Four times each year, construction teams are dispatched to help meet practical needs of children and their families in developing countries. In its inaugural year, projects included construction of feeding centers, medical clinics, community facilities repairs and renovations and construction of housing and recreational facilities for street children.

Feed The Children has continued to send relief supplies to Afghanistan and Iraq, especially those who continue to live in Internally Displaced Persons Camps. As an implementing partner for the UN World Food Programme in Maslakh IDP camp, FTC International was contracted to build 25 bakeries in the camp outside Herat in western Afghanistan. These bakeries supplied bread for nearly 300,000 people each day and continue to operate to meet the needs of the community.

In Iraq, Feed The Children has provided food, hygiene products, educational materials shelter materials, aqua boxes and other supplies to more than 1,500 refugee families in Jordan and another 1,500 families in slum areas around Baghdad.

Feed The Children is a Christian, international non-profit relief organization, founded by faith and operated in accordance with biblical principles of caring for those in need with love and compassion. Prayer plays a vital role in our daily activities and strategic planning. Our founders, management and staff are dedicated professionals who recognize that all we accomplish is through God's grace and provision. We share a passion for providing help and hope to ALL hungry children and families in need; as called for by the Bible, the Torah, the Koran and by most other religions throughout the world.

#### **The Need:**

In 1998, more than 10 million American households (9.7%) were defined as "food insecure." In more common terms, children and their families did not have access to enough food to fully meet their basic needs each month.<sup>2</sup> Once thought to be a problem found only in the rural areas of Appalachia and Native American reservations, hunger flourishes from coast to coast; in large metropolitan cities, suburbia and small towns. Childhood poverty has both immediate and long lasting effects. Children living below the poverty line are more likely to have difficulties in school, become teen parents and as adults earn less and be unemployed more frequently.<sup>3</sup> They are

prone to health problems and chronic diseases. In 1999, sixteen percent of all American children lived below the poverty line, including 30% of all Hispanic children and 33% of all black children.<sup>4</sup> Official poverty statistics are becoming more difficult to interpret. As states deal with severe fiscal crises, many have been forced to reduce access to assistance programs. Some have arbitrarily lowered the poverty line, excluding millions from assistance programs. This reduction in government assistance, coupled with an increase in single parent households, employment shifts and other demographic trends has produced a greater demand for assistance from organizations like Feed The Children and its network of local agencies. A recent survey by America's Second Harvest reported that demand for food aid increased more than 15% in 2002. At the same time, production and distribution efficiencies like just in time inventory and point of sale ordering have reduced the amount of "close dated" food available for donation.

Government assistance programs like Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), Food Stamps, Women Infants and Children (WIC) and others are designed to be a safety net for American families experiencing temporary hardship. Although they provide invaluable assistance, many families simply find themselves running out of food before they run out of month. Single mothers can pay as much as half of their take-home-pay for childcare. Working two and sometimes three part-time jobs, which do not provide health insurance, minor illnesses can become financially devastating. During the winter months, many households must make unfathomable decisions between food, heat or medical care.

#### **Faith Based Organizations – Effective and Efficient**

By necessity, government programs are designed to address common problems on a large scale. Unfortunately, the best designs cannot possibly address all circumstances. Stories of children and families "falling through the cracks of the system" are so common that only the most extreme find their way to public light. As public assistance administrators direct resources to the most

needy, children and families living on the edge of poverty find themselves with fewer options than poorer families. Rigid program parameters help assure fairness to qualifying recipients, but by definition exclude significant numbers of people who through no fault of their own discover they simply do not qualify for many programs.

From an administrative standpoint, many public assistance delivery programs are modeled after other government procurement procedures requiring several layers of checks and balances. Developed to ensure taxpayer dollars are spent effectively, these bureaucratic policies can actually reduce efficiency thereby decreasing scarce resources available for children and families in need. Faith based organizations like Feed The Children have proved to be extremely efficient in providing assistance to families. Donors want their donations to provide assistance, not pay salaries, rent, utilities or overhead. We are called to be the best stewards of resources entrusted to us to accomplish our mission. Just as in a free market economy, higher quality and lower cost attract resources. Many CEO's of major corporations credit their small business experience for their success. In the business world, efficiency translates to survival and growth of the business. For Feed The Children, efficiency translates to survival and growth of children. In FY 2003, more than 88 cents of every dollar donated to Feed The Children was spent on program services. Fundraising expenses accounted for just nine cents. Management and support services accounted for the remaining three cents. We constantly strive to improve these ratios in order to provide more assistance to more people.

We can be much more responsive to shifts in trends and circumstances, developing new programs and reallocating resources immediately. New programs in the public sector can take months and even years to be approved, funded and implemented. When disaster strikes, Feed The Children trucks can begin moving relief supplies in minutes.

In Afghanistan, more than 500,000 people sought refuge in the IDP camps established by the United Nations in Herat. Some had walked for days, carrying children, the elderly, the infirm and whatever possessions they could manage. They arrived in Herat as many as 10,000 per day. UN staff could not handle the volume. Waiting to register could take days. Food and shelter could be attained only after being registered. Immediately, Feed The Children flew supplies in to meet the needs of those waiting to register.

Because they live in the heart of poverty, our network of more than 60,000 food pantries, feeding centers, shelters, churches and community support organizations knows the unique needs of their communities. They know the programs available locally and how to access them. They share our passion to help children in need and stand shoulder to shoulder with us in the fight against child hunger in America. We measure our progress by faces and names, not numbers. Through them, we are a part of hundreds of communities without the expense of staff and overhead.

**A Leap of Faith – Steps in a New Direction:**

On September 19<sup>th</sup>, Secretary of Agriculture Ann Veneman, White House Office of Faith Based and Community Initiatives Director Jim Towe and Feed The Children president Larry Jones announced the National Nonprofit Humanitarian Initiative at a press conference and food distribution in Washington, D.C. This innovative program provides surplus nonfat dry milk, purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation, to charities that have never had access to government commodities because of their evangelical activities. Last month, Feed The Children delivered more than 26 million pounds of this milk to families across the country, further enhancing the nutritional value of the food we provide on a daily basis and clearly demonstrating our capacity to move large quantities of commodities quickly and efficiently.



Feed the Children raises monetary support from the general public through the mail and a weekly television program. These funds deliver help and hope to families and assure that there is never a charge to recipients. But keeping trucks on the road costs money. Fuel, maintenance, licensing and insurance are all expensive and keep us from serving more children in need. We would like to see an increase in funding available to faith-based organizations like Feed The Children specifically for transportation. The Denton Amendment makes these funds available for overseas shipments in times of emergency through USAID. We strongly encourage the creation of a similar program to address domestic relief efforts by organizations responding to the every day crisis of child hunger in America.

We sincerely hope that the National Nonprofit Humanitarian Initiative will be expanded to include other surplus commodities. Further, we hope it can be a model for future initiatives to provide services to children and families in need from other federal agencies like Health and Human Services and FEMA, The Millennium Challenge Account, Food For Progress and others. We hope it will become a model for international relief through US Agency for International Development, increasing access for faith-based organizations to provide basic relief and development more efficiently and more effectively.

We support the underlying principles of the President's Faith Based and Community Initiatives and subsequent revisions of the CARE Act as well as House Con. Res. 108, which encourages corporations to make greater contributions to faith based organizations battling societal challenges. We agree that faith-based organizations should have access to service delivery for federal relief programs. Not because we are entitled to compete, but because we can compete and we can raise the standard for efficiency and effectiveness to deliver resources to children and families in need. We can fill gaps with private funds. We can be more responsive to changes in economic circumstances and events. We can enhance the level of service through caring and compassionate programs. We can mobilize thousands of volunteers to join us in the fight against

child hunger in America. Faith-based charities like Feed The Children and our partners provide a vital service to local communities and families in need, but those needs are far bigger than we are. As much as we accomplish, we need to do more. And with your help we will!

On behalf of Larry and Frances Jones, Feed The Children and our network of dedicated partners and supporters, I commend this subcommittee and the individual members of it for your work and dedication to improving the lives of those we are called to serve. I applaud your leadership in seeking new and innovative ways to improve the safety net for America's most vulnerable children and their families.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to share our story and describe our calling. May God bless each of you and your families as you continue to lead this great nation.

---

<sup>1</sup> World Food Programme, June 2002

<sup>2</sup> *Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Hunger by State, 1996-1998*, Mark Nord, Kyle Jemison, Gary Bickel

<sup>3</sup> *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being 2001*, Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

Mr. SOUDER. And we have two reasons why we have eight of you in one panel, and I'll ask questions for each of you at the end of your testimonies. We have to be out of here at 2.

Also, we are still putting witness panels together, which is why some of you have prepared and some you have less prepared cards, as we were accommodating more requests and trying to make sure we had a good mix of the panels.

It will make it a little chaotic in the questioning, but it will also enable us to have a good discussion. I also wanted to say directly to Steve that, in addition, Fort Wayne, IN, is my main base, but Elkhart, where you've recently taken the Bay area facility for distribution of food, is an area I'm familiar with. Welcome to Indiana.

And I know you've had lots of support up in that area. And we're working hard in the farm belt with lots of ways to help a very committed region in that area with Mennonite Relief and the HEPA project and many other organizations. And I think you'll find it a great place to work with. Now we'll go to Mr. Dean Tollefson from Community Ministers Unlimited here in Colorado Springs. Is that correct?

**STATEMENT OF DEAN E. TOLLEFSON, COMMUNITY MINISTERS  
UNLIMITED**

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Souder, and your staff for helping to deal me in today. I found out about this yesterday morning, and I'm pleased to be here.

I am a former college administrator and teacher. My name is Dean, but I was one once.

Mr. SOUDER. So it's not like the senator in Lake Wobegone where his parents named him Senator?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No, it's a nomination. I'm a former officer in the Marine Corps, and a legal officer. I wanted to lay out two things today after talking about where I'm coming from.

The first one is the context for the work here in this community. And the second one, specifically, are the problems associated with what we are doing here or not doing, as the case may be.

You touched on the legal matters and the legal issues, but you also said you're functioning under an Executive order. My guess is, as a former exec, you're very much interested in the good management of that order. And I want to address that.

First of all, I'm head of the administerial service here. We serve those that are excluded, ignored, or who don't conform to some interest or litany, or really just mantra. What I'm concerned about in my work is that an increasing number of people who are coming to me say because of that narrow view, they are losing their sense of the sacred.

It's really dangerous for a nation to lose its sense of the sacred, because somebody decides what is religious on very narrow grounds.

Second, I want to say that I am a long-time member of the Pikes Peak Inter-Faith Council. This includes a broad range of religious faiths and belief among us. It includes Native Americans, the oldest faith in the area. It includes Orthodox, Catholics, main-line Protestants, Muslims, Unitarian universals, Bahais, etc. All of us.

We are excluded from celebrating the National Day of Prayer in this community by people that you have just heard from. Remember that the lady who heads that is either an honorary chairman or a chairman, and just really doesn't want to have anything to do with all other main-liners and all of the other religious traditions, some of which have a very long history in both western and the eastern world.

I forgot to mention Buddhists and Hindus, and we should have done that. We are all included in that, and we are excluded from the National Day of Prayer in this community because of our breadth and depth. You want to think about that in terms of what that means in this community, and what is the direction that we take because of that very narrow and exclusivist view.

I regret very much Tom Minnery saying that you have to hire according to your own will. If he were to participate with us, he would see that faith is not narrowly understood.

And that when hiring, one ought to think about competence, not merely conformity.

I want to read, first of all, in the context of what we're doing here and the Faith Partners in our town that is working on the issue that you're here to explore. First of all, a quote, a commentary from Mr. Barry Torvag. This is a transcript of what I first saw on PBS, and then read about in a transcript from National Public Radio.

He said, "The first step is to love them." I'm not sure this is a quote. Oh, yes, it is a quote. "The first step is to love them"—he's member of the board of directors of Faith Partners—"and to care for them, and not to attempt to share with them necessarily any of the concepts surrounding the Christian faith, but just be there. Love them and accept them, and then take a few months of the program"—"and that takes a few months in the program. And that's Phase 1. And then the next phase is inviting them to explore the concept of faith in God through Jesus Christ, which is the Christian faith."

I think it's somewhere between 85 percent range that's come to some relationship with God through Christ as a consequence of our participation with them. Do you have the transcript? Yes.

Ms. Jaramillo says subsequently, she calls it a covert religious mission. "I think it's covert, because as I use the word 'covert,' 95 percent of the Christian world is uncomfortable sharing their faith with people." That statement, Ms. Jaramillo, is an unmitigated outrage. It's arrogant. It's mean-spirited. It is totally inappropriate in a religious community. "And why do you have to tip-toe around that," Mr. Schwartlein says, the interviewer. "Why do you need to be, you know, covert in your work?" And then, "Because we're using government money."

Well, you can see the problem. And I don't need to go on with that. What I want to do now is go on. That's the context in which we work. Am I on red already? I wanted to talk about the contract that the Faith Partners is totally in violation of.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, why don't you briefly run through them.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The first one is they should contact organizations from various religious backgrounds. We have 150 people representing about 24 religious organizations in this community, and

we have never been contacted by Faith Partners ever. None of us. Ever. On any grounds. Not on our program or anything. Second, the contract shall be monitored to ensure that no participating organization discriminates against any client in offering and providing services to them. They don't even have an inclination to do that. Their intention is not that.

"The contractor shall provide evaluation of the content and application to be sure that they meet client needs, and do not violate the client's right to choice of nonintrusive secular services." It's another violation. They don't do that.

Another one is No. 18. "The contract shall provide outreach services and presentations to the entire faith community." It hasn't happened. It's only to their own. This is real trouble to us. I'll stop there and honor you.

What we're dealing with is narrow, self-righteous, and even self-service issues. And it may be, sir, that the worst place for you to try to make faith-based initiatives work is in Colorado Springs, because of the very narrow interpretations of what faith, even Christianity, means.

Remember 23 centuries ago, we heard Aristotle say that, "The first way to screw up your mind and to enforce all the possibility of knowledge is to exercise the fallacies of mere assertion." Just because somebody says something is true doesn't make it true.

So you want to think about where you're applying what you're attempting to get. When government controls faith, faith doesn't work because free enterprise in the marketplace of belief builds faith and faith communities. And what is being compromised here is that free enterprise expression of faith.

When faith controls government, you get recession that is utterly diabolical, and we see that everywhere in the world. And we have seen it in our own country. Do you remember what the faith community said of Blacks? "The only way to save them is to enslave them."

Mr. SOUDER. With all due respect, that was not the entire faith community. Abolitionists were also led by the church.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That was the heavy view in the south, and it's only as they got away from that have they begun to grow and be progressive. So we want to be very careful about promoting one point of view.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you for your testimony.

Because it's important in the hearings to have some diversity, you made some specific charges with Ms. Jaramillo's testimony on a couple of particulars. But I don't want to get into a heavy debate over one organization. But it is a little bit enlightening as to how it actually gets applied on a specific basis.

But I don't want that to be predominant the rest of this hearing.

Next we'll go to Ms. Littrell from Inter-Faith Hospitality Network.

#### **STATEMENT OF SHARON LITRELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF INTERFAITH HOSPITALITY NETWORK**

Ms. LITRELL. Thank you very much for having me. I am Sharon Littrell. I am the executive director of Interfaith Hospitality Net-

work here in Colorado Springs. We are a secular nonprofit organization that houses homeless families in existing facilities.

Generally, we use church buildings to house the families that come to our program, though that is not always the case. In some places they use hospitals. And, in fact, Penrose Hospital has offered that, if necessary, we could house our families there.

So we are Interfaith in that we work with many, many different religious organizations to house these families, and what we do is keep our overhead very low by not having to build buildings.

As I said, by our name, we are not a religious organization. We do not arrange for hospitality or fix up lonely individuals with places to assuage their lonely feelings or needs.

At Christmas-time, I had somebody call me up and say, "I don't have a place to go for Christmas, and I would really like some companionship. Would you be willing to tell me where to go?" So you can see that we get some mixed views about who we are.

We are a community-based organization that has experienced wonderful partnerships with over 30 area churches and synagogues in this community. The partnering religious facility provides a place for IHN families to sleep. It provides members to fix and share hot meals every night of the year.

This helps the four to eight families that must use our facilities to save money, and locate affordable housing. The national organization to which IHN formally belongs was formally called National Leadership Hospitality, recently changed its name to Family Promise, because the national board feels that Family Promise more accurately defines who we are. In Colorado Springs, IHN appeals to many religious organizations that have an outward mission. They help those who are in need, regardless of religious involvement. IHN guest families are often relieved that we do not require a statement of faith before we offer shelter, food, and hope.

They also appreciate that the folks who help, volunteers and staff, do so because they are acting out their faith, not pushing it.

Many of the people who participate providing services have their own religious faith. They just use their actions to show it, as opposed to words to prove it.

In the past 4 years, IHN has received HUD funding through the continuum of care, which is a supernova stream of funding. We have applied for and received city of Colorado Springs funding, and presently have a Health and Human Services grant to initiate a jobs program for the homeless who use the services of IHN, Ecumenical Social Services, West Side Cares, or the Pikes Peak Community Action Agency.

We also qualify for and receive FEMA funding. In other words, we do have a lot of Federal funding, and that helps us to be able to provide for the services that we give to people in this community. And by having that type of funding, we agree that we will do so, provide services without religious means or qualifications.

Our services are provided without means testing for staff or clients, and they have positive results. During 2003, our families maintained an 86 plus percent success rate, as high as a 92 percent success rate toward the end of the year.

That is, families entered IHN as homeless people. They worked at jobs to get back on to their feet. They saved money, and they

located affordable housing. The Federal funding allowed IHN to provide expert case management services, a family day center for weekends and days when no work was available. It provided diapers, some clothing, cars for several families. And we did it by teaching, not preaching.

Upon leaving IHN, several of our families were sufficiently impressed with the help and support that they received from the churches where they had slept that they returned to join that church. They did this on their own, without being pressured.

Moreover, they now give back to the homeless community by helping at IHN or helping house homeless families at their place of worship.

As a director of a nonprofit agency in Colorado Springs, I join other agencies seeking funds that would further our programs. IHN seeks a level playing field where we have an equal chance of receiving funds. Not one that stacks the favor in one group or another based on an artificial measure of religiosity. I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and would welcome your questions later.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Reverend Dean Cowles is president of the YouthPartnersNet in Denver, CO. You used to be in Indiana.

**STATEMENT OF REVEREND DEAN COWLES, PRESIDENT,  
YOUTHPARTNERSNET**

Rev. COWLES. I was for 10 years, and then I found religion when I got to Colorado. My pastor said, "You know why you're moving to Colorado? You can't get close to God unless you're 5,000 feet above sea level."

But I did have 10 years experience in Indianapolis, starting a local faith-based ministry on East Washington Street there, and Mayor Goldsmith was our mayor. Over the years that I have been involved in urban faith-based ministry, and starting a homeless center, and a litany of other projects, it's my firm belief that the present administration is on the right track with leveling the playing field as the faith-based White House paper came out calling it.

It's time for faith-based organizations to be able to have a chance to share what works. We're not talking about, you know, debating here who's better, who's right, who's wrong. We're just talking about what works. And if it works, great.

And we have found thousands of organizations that I represent around the country through YouthPartnersNet and other compassionate ministries, that these programs work, and they work with far more impact for less money than the war on poverty welfare programs that have been pushed by government over the past 30 to 40 years.

As I said, I was a founder and director of Shepherd Community Urban Ministry in Indianapolis. I was also the founder and director of Crossroads in the Westwood neighborhood of Denver. In 2000, I became the director for the Compassion USA Ministry Program, and just recently we have spun off that division of Compassion into YouthPartnersNet. We are trying to build capacity with hundreds of faith-based local grass roots organizations that don't have the sophistication to apply for government funds or private funds for that matter. They pretty much do it as volunteers, with tithes and offer-

ings from their local church, and do a tremendous work in their local communities.

Thousands and thousands of these grass roots organizations have continued this kind of work long before this debate ever began.

In a book called the Tragedy of American Compassion written by Marvin Okasky, which is in my written testimony, which I don't have time to read my whole testimony, but he makes a great point in that before government entered this, it was the church that was doing it.

But in the 1920's and 1930's, the 1920's and 1930, the church got out of that and government got into it. And we have seen some problems since then. So he's advocating, as I am advocating, that we level the playing field, and get more resources back into these local neighborhood and community faith-based organizations.

And it can be done, and we have proven that it can be done without this whole debate of do they have to go to religious services? Do they have to do this? No, no, no.

As you'll find throughout the country, these kind of services are provided with the most genuine spirit and love, and without coercion in most cases. Sure there will always be a few that take advantage of that. But I have seen across the country that these groups do it in a wonderful, loving, compassionate way.

And we believe in the President's initiative. In fact, I served for the last few years on the Compassion Capital Fund review. And it's been a wonderful experience to see grant applications come from a variety of faith-based organizations to impact their communities.

And we have gone through those applications, and have rewarded those with very excellent programming without a whole lot of money. Our encouragement to the Congress is to continue to fund that fund, as well as the other faith-based funds through other departments that have other faith-based provisions, and to continue to raise the level of funding for those faith-based groups.

It provides more bang for the buck and anything else that we see coming along in the 20 years of my experience. We also, here in Colorado, have experienced some good funding locally from the Colorado legislature to the grant money for after-school programs. That's been very successful. And the great thing about the funds that have come through Crossroads of the Rockies for \$163,000, is that enables them to employ four staff full-time. And they worked with 350 youth. And, in addition, they have \$350,000 of volunteer time that comes in every year.

This is repeated around the country, and we're very excited about continuing to enhance those relationships. The winds in Washington are indeed changing, and we're grateful for that.

20 years ago my wife and I would have never dreamed of being invited to this type of hearing. So my hat's off to you and the other Members.

I'd also like to highlight in my last 16 seconds that the work that Mayor Goldsmith did was a national model in Indiana. But in his two books that I wanted to highlight for the record, Mayor Steven Goldsmith wrote Putting Faith in Neighborhoods: Making Cities Work Through Grassroots Citizenship and the 21st Century City and Resurrecting Urban America.



Our mayor was a tremendous help to us, saved money for the city, employed homeless and teenagers, as well. And we have seen over the years that these faith-based partnerships work in a wonderful way. And we look forward to our continued discussion. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony.  
[The prepared statement of Reverend Cowles follows:]

**"Faith-based Perspectives on the Provision of Community Services."**

Congressional Hearing, Colorado Springs, January 23, 2004

By Rev. Dean Cowles

YouthPartnersNET President

P.O. Box 11909

Denver, CO. 80211-0909

1-800-334-KIDS

[www.youthpartnersnet.org](http://www.youthpartnersnet.org)

[dcowles@youthpartnersnet.org](mailto:dcowles@youthpartnersnet.org)

In his revealing book, The Tragedy of American Compassion, Marvin Olasky makes a compelling case that in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century, it was the Church that provided the moral and civic compass to generate compassionate assistance, not the government. He documents how tens of thousands of faith-based ministries across the United States originated out of Christians good hearts and common sense. These compassionate ministries birthed the welfare agencies, soup kitchens, orphanages, homes for destitute women, rescue missions, inner city medical clinics, and the university systems for higher learning. The genius of this grass-roots movement was that it was local. Each community of faith had a unique vantage point in assessing the causes and solutions to the problems of poverty in their area.

Unfortunately, the tragedy of this community faith driven compassion, thus the title of Olasky's book, is that during the late 1920's and 30's, the government started assuming the role and responsibility of taking care of those living in poverty and the Church began to abandon its earlier commitment to the orphans and widows which James 1: 27 tells us is "pure and undefiled religion in the sight of our God and Father."

Therefore, for the last sixty to seventy years, government has been casting its nets on the side of larger programs dictated from Washington with little regard for the local community solutions that worked so well in the past. Sure enough, the nets woven together by Washington were full of holes, and those who were most in need of help slipped through the cracks of the so-called “social safety net”.

I am not advocating that government get out of casting nets and doing its part to keep people from falling through the cracks. I’ve often said, “It only took four days to get the Hebrews out of Egypt. But it took forty years to get Egypt out of the Hebrews.” It will probably take a whole new generation to undo the damage this “slave to welfare” mentality fostered by government programs has done over the past forty years. I’m simply suggesting that together we mend those nets and throw them on the other side where they were working so well for so many years. I’m talking about active partnerships with faith-based ministries.

Not only does this partnership between government and the faith community make sense when dealing with human problems from a historical and practical perspective, but I have seen this work in a personal way. It took us several years in Denver to gather the resources and talents of churches, community, and religious foundations, volunteer contractors, in order to renovate a formerly condemned roller rink and eye sore in our neighborhood. We invited former Oklahoma Congressman J.C. Watts to Denver to speak at a Citywide Prayer Breakfast and dedicate our new neighborhood faith based urban ministry called Crossroads of the Rockies. In his remarks Congressman Watts said; “Compassion should not be

measured by how many people are on the government roles but rather by how many people can be taken off those roles." He was speaking about the wonderful efforts of government and faith-based partnerships that were lifting people up both economically and spiritually. That renovated building now serves as a church, community center, after-school tutoring and mentoring program, job training and computer lab, food and clothing bank and much more. Watts was highlighting the success Crossroads has had in transforming those on the other side of the tracks, on the other side of poverty, other side of prejudice, other side of addiction and abuse.

For an example of how this Faith based and Government partnership works, soon after the dedication of our building one of our supporters who also happened to be a local Senator in the Colorado legislature became involved. When he heard me speak in his church he arranged a meeting in his office with several other faith-based ministries and told us about a new program called "Youth Crime Prevention Initiative" (YCPI). After our meeting, one phone call from the Senator and a YCPI staff member called me to arrange a site visit. Within five minutes she said to me, "Dean, you got it". I assumed she meant we had what it takes to run a good program. She explained, "I mean, you got the grant. This is exactly the kind of program and place we want to fund. Go right now and fill out the grant and get it sent in right away." So we did.

The next step was to go before a legislative review committee who would vote on which groups got the funds. We were told that we only had 10 minutes. I took our children's director with me, along with a mother and her son who we had helped. We rehearsed our presentation, and walked in to the room. When the group in front of us got up, we were surprised to see

our local community police officer get up with them. He saw us and immediately came over and gave us hugs as we sat down. The Chairperson asked, "Officer Manny, you know these people?" "Oh yes", he replied. "Crossroads is one of the best groups to help kids in the Westwood neighborhood". She said, "Well, can you stay for their interview?" He agreed. I was a bit thrown off from my carefully prepared plan and remarks.

They started asking Officer Manny questions about Crossroads. He shared how when he first started patrolling the community he would get calls in the projects about this young Hispanic boy, pointing to Stephen sitting next to me, who was getting into trouble and tagging buildings with graffiti. But now, thanks to Crossroads programs and most importantly their staff and children's director, who took a real interest in this troubled youth, Stephen and his whole family had turned their lives around. Needless to say, I didn't have to say much.

Two weeks later we got official notification that we were approved for \$20,000, our largest private or public grant up to that point. Over the next several years Crossroads received over \$100,000 from this state fund dedicated to keeping our young people off the streets and in safe after school and summer activities, with no strings attached.

The added blessing to this story is that Stephen's mom saw the change in him and started coming to volunteer and then attending church with her son. On Pentecost Sunday, she turned her life over to God in a marvelous way. Soon, Bonnie was so indispensable that we hired her as our receptionist, her first job after spending her life growing up on an Indian reservation and living off welfare as a single mom.

Her on and off boyfriend, who was also Stephen's father, saw the dramatic change in Bonnie's life so he started coming to church. A few

months later he came up before the service and asked me, “Pastor Dean, would it be alright if I got saved today?” We had a tremendous celebration as Steve and one of his former drinking buddies knelt at the altar to ask Jesus into their hearts. Now the whole family was worshipping together.

A few months later Steve asked if he could give his testimony. At the end he thanked the church for all their love and support. Then he asked Bonnie to come forward. He got down on one knee and in front of the whole congregation said, “Bonnie I love you so much. Would you marry me?” The crowd went wild as she hugged him and with tears in her eyes gave a resounding “Yes”.

I met with them for marital counseling and they wanted to get married on Sunday. I thought it was a great idea, after all they both got saved on Sunday in the Church, got engaged on Sunday, why not get married on Sunday. Besides, the church family was about all the family they had. Bonnie’s parents had already passed away. So guess who walked her down the aisle as Steve, his former drinking partner and I waited at the altar? That’s right, Stephen. The young boy who was first reached by our after-school tutoring program. Now Bonnie is our Office Manager, Steve is the Building supervisor and Stephen works as his dad’s assistant.

This same story is being repeated in countless communities all across America. As I travel to visit our YouthPartnersNET ministry partners I have the privilege to meet many families like this who have been reunited because of tremendously compassionate people and ministries fighting on the front lines of poverty. I have seen first hand the tremendous impact these groups make. I’ve met their volunteers and staffs, incredibly dedicated and underpaid people. They serve because they have a passion for people. And money doesn’t buy passion, a calling does. More importantly I have met the

people and the children and youth these faith-based ministries serve. Believe me, it is the best dollars we spend in local, state, and federal government. People of faith need to get organized and lobby for more of these funds filtered down to the grass-roots level where the real impact and changed lives takes place.

Every August I devote a full week of my time to go back to Washington D.C. as a grant reviewer for the President's new Faith Based Initiative called the Compassion Capitol Fund. Our panel reviews between 12-14 grant applications from "intermediary" faith and community-based groups. It's always a daunting feeling when we arrive Monday morning and are given our stack of applications which usually total more than 800 pages, but we manage to read and score them all by the end of the week. It is a bit like going back to graduate school. I love reading the applications because I get to see all the wonderful things going on around the country through small faith and community based groups. Unfortunately Congress so far has only approved a very small budget dedicated to federal faith-based programs. Therefore each year we get many more worthy applications than we can fund and have to turn down hundreds.

The winds in Washington and Statehouses across America are indeed changing. Almost 20 years ago, when my wife and I started delivering faith-based services at our first urban assignment in Indianapolis, Indiana, there was no way we could get any help from the government. However, it doesn't take much to make a small change that can lead to major accomplishments. Indianapolis elected a young bright Mayor, Steven Goldsmith. Early on in his administration he advocated an increased role for faith based ministries

and changed the landscape of public-private ventures in Indianapolis. His leadership and cutting edge ideas became a national model and greatly influenced President Bush and the current climate of faith based initiatives. Our ministry in Indianapolis called Shepherd Community was the pilot site for many of the Mayor's innovative programs like the Church & Parks Partnership and the Front Porch coalition.

The Church & Parks Partnership for example was a "win-win" relationship whereby local churches took over the responsibility and "ownership" of mowing, cleaning, and maintaining area parks. This unique partnership saved the city money, gave faith based ministries needed income and employed at-risk teens and homeless men. In addition, the local community took pride in the park and this renewal caused the citizens and congregation members to reclaim the park from drug dealers and gangs. (See Goldsmith's books, Putting Faith in Neighborhoods: Making Cities Work through Grassroots Citizenship & The Twenty-First Century City: Resurrecting Urban America.)

I'm confident this new fresh whirlwind -- and those of us who support, equip, train, and encourage these grass roots organizations -- will see many more government funds and programs turned back to the people who know their communities best -- local practitioners.

However, there is a note of caution. Lots of people come to me and ask how they can get some government grants. While I encourage them to check out local resources first and get to know their locally elected representatives as I did, I also remind them that government funds can sometimes be a curse as well as a blessing. I've seen too many organizations "follow the money" without first following their passion and call. They change their focus to get funds or become dependent on one source of



funding and when it dries up, they dry up. Be sure you know what you want to do and how to do it. Grants aren't given just because there are good folks out there doing good things. You have to have a demonstrated plan, purpose, and appropriate passion.

What we're talking about is more than mere welfare reform: we are talking about personal transformation. As I've often said in training seminars and conferences, Government has tried to change behavior by training the hands or educating the head. Yet the first step is not about the head or the hands, the problem starts with a person's heart. Transformation must include not only the physical and emotional, but most importantly, the spiritual. For too long secular and even some religious programs for the poor have tried to help people, but with disappointing results. Why has the so-called "War On Poverty" been a miserable failure? Because well-intentioned programs have addressed people's heads and hands, but failed to change and cleanse the heart. The heart controls the hands and head.

Training and education are important but if the heart is not changed, things remain the same; apartments get trashed, employers get ripped off, wives get beaten, and children are abused. One local community official who visited our ministry summed it all up, "I see why you're so successful. You get to the heart of the matter."

What is even more important however, is that those in the faith community do what they do from the heart, and they do it without counting the cost. It comes from a calling higher than mere civic duty. And it is that higher calling which adds blessing upon blessing to their efforts. Remember these words found in Jeremiah 29; 7 "Seek the welfare (the shalom) of the

city . . . and pray to the Lord on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare.”

Bill Schorer, a long time former staff person for a United States Senator wrote The Cathedral Within about this heart and passion needed to bring lasting social change. After decades of working in the political system, Bill changed his career. He saw that the best solutions and the best ideas came from local people meeting local needs. Therefore, he started a group called “Sharing Our Strength” which is dedicated to ending hunger here in America and abroad. His group has raised hundreds of millions of dollars.

In his intriguing book, Bill talks about those great European Cathedrals that took hundreds of years to build. The amazing part was that those who laid the foundations knew they would never see the end result. Yet they worked tirelessly on their construction anyway because they knew something wonderful would result for future generations. Schorer shares numerous stories of those who have laid down great foundations, through private local not-for-profit organizations that will last and accomplish great things. He notes that in the past 30 years, over 800,000 such organizations have sprung up across America. I’d say those are some pretty good nets. His conclusion is that each of us must exhibit passion for the disadvantaged and resolve to build the Cathedral within oneself, which will translate into building great things for society on the outside.

There was one aspect of Cathedral building he points out of which I was not aware. Schorer notes that the very first thing any community did before laying one stone in place for the future Cathedral, was to go to the countryside and plant vast forests of trees. They knew that over the 500 years it would take to complete this masterpiece, it would take thousands of

mature trees to supply the scaffolding, firewood, and timber necessary to build this monument to God.

If we want long term solutions and lasting institutions, we're going to have to invest a lot of time and money right now in planting hundreds and thousands of trees. We will need faith-based ministries who serve as "oaks of righteousness" on every other corner in our high-risk communities to stem the tide.

Billy Graham tells a story of a young Baptist preacher who loved to watch horse races. So every Sunday afternoon after church he would go by the local race track to watch the races through a knot hole in the fence, because a Baptist preacher wouldn't be caught dead at a racetrack. This particular Sunday, he saw a Catholic Priest bless just one horse in each of the first six races, and sure enough that horse won. By the seventh and last race, this preacher said, "This won't be gambling, it's a sure thing." So he rushed in, watched which horse the Priest blessed in the seventh race and put his entire paycheck on that horse. As the gate opened, his horse burst in front. He led all the way down the backstretch. The preacher was already counting his money in his head. All of a sudden, the horse dropped dead in the middle of the track. Stunned, the preacher went over to the Priest and said, "What's up? I saw you bless six horses in six races and they all won. I put all my money on the horse you blessed in this last race and he died." The Priest calmly replied, "I take it son you're not a Roman Catholic". To which this young preacher responded, "Why no. I'm a Baptist, thank you." "Well, that's too bad" the Priest continued. "For if you were a Roman Catholic you would have known the difference between a blessing and the last rites."

Our job is to point people in the right direction and help them learn how to recognize the difference between any funding source that can be a blessing or the last rites. We all must be wise in seeking after funding that will release rather than restrict our ministries.

Our challenge is to think outside the traditional boxes, throw our nets on the other side of the boat, be creative, and be wise when “following the money” or the latest fad or ill-fated horse. We need to start building those Cathedrals within and planting great oaks. Let’s work together to relieve the plight of human suffering in our communities, to lift up the fallen, to give hope to the homeless, and peace to the impoverished. Jesus began his public ministry by citing Isaiah 61: 1-2

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set free those who are downtrodden, to proclaim the favorable year of the Lord” (Luke 4:18)

Mr. SOUDER. Next is Ms. Jean Robinson from Denver Urban Ministries.

**STATEMENT OF JEAN ROBINSON, DENVER URBAN MINISTRY**

Ms. ROBINSON. I am Jean Robinson with Denver Urban Ministries, and we appreciate being heard today. Denver Urban Ministries is a 501(c)3 human service organization. We provide emergency services and basic needs such as food and clothing, as well as infant items, rent, and utility assistance.

Through our job services, we provide the tools needed to provide employment. Through our education and advocacy programs, we provide ways for people to get back to their community.

We were founded in 1981 by the Methodist church, and continue to serve as their mission arm in the community. We receive our funding from a variety of sources, including private foundations, individuals, and about 70 congregations, most located in the Denver metro area.

We were founded by the Methodists, but we are non-ecumenical. Our annual budget is about \$500,000 a year.

The purpose of DenUM is to nurse the spirit for community. We provide resources for people in crisis, and create opportunities for individuals in community growth and service. We have many different faiths represented by the staffing volunteers at DenUM. We do not discriminate in hiring in any way. We do not proselytize in any way. And we do not believe in putting any condition on the receipt of our services. People that come to us are in crisis, and they are vulnerable. They need assistance, not prayers and coercion and extra stress. They need common sense solutions to their problems.

We do work, we do the work we do because we want to put our faith into action. We feel good about the work we do, because we see results which are measurable. There has never been any discrimination in faith-based agencies receiving government funding.

The government has always provided funding to religiously affiliated organizations that provide social services. We were on a level playing field with every other agency that had a quality program and did not proselytize to their clients or discriminate in their hiring practices.

The government has funded large faith-based organizations such as Catholic Charities and United Jewish Communities and smaller agencies such as DenUM. There is an important difference between being affiliated with a religion and being a religious organization, and I think that's an important distinction to note.

By enacting faith-based initiatives, the government has actually taken away the level playing field and given faith-based organizations an advantage, or at least a leg up, and this is wrong. If you can't do the work to apply for the grant, you can't do the paperwork involved in accountability.

Another result has been to take much needed money away from direct services to put into technical assistance for small agencies or churches to learn how to access these funds. There's a Web site. There's been government sponsored workshops at Federal and State levels.

In the meantime, there has been little change to the amount of cash assistance people receive when they are in programs, such as

Social security or disability. Many people believe that all faith-based must be in favor of faith-based initiatives, but many of us are not.

Many faith-based organizations are very concerned about the rights of our most vulnerable populations. At DenUM, we believe that if you help stabilize a family through income and housing, people will have time to explore their faith.

We have witnessed many forms of religious abuse on families who are trying to get through a tough time only to be contacted with additional obstacles to attaining their goal by organizations who put conditions upon receiving their services.

For example, an agency in Denver requires someone to attend religious services to partake in an evening meal. This may seem like a small requirement to some, but that's the point. If you are hungry or in need of shelter for yourself or your family, you will do anything required to get the services you need. It's wrong to require that people conform to your belief system in order to access to basic needs.

It is not only wrong to insist upon these requirements, but it is a clear violation of the separation between church and State if you are receiving government funding for that program.

There are pros and cons to government funding. We have had experience with two different funding sources. Neither are a part of the faith-based initiative or Colorado Compassion Fund.

The Emergency Food and Shelter Program formally known as FEMA is a grant. We were awarded the money for rent assistance and food purchased. The money is deposited in our bank account. We document the money, spend the money, and report on the money.

If you have good recordkeepers, this is an easy program to monitor. Contracts are more difficult. An emergency shelter that we run was granted a contract awarded to us by Denver County in which you will be reimbursed for funds.

Our contract was for \$14,000 for rent assistance to prevent homelessness. During the contract year, we paid upfront \$14,000 for rent assistance to clients that were reimbursed. This works out fine as long as the agency that is reimbursing you does so in a timely manner.

Denver Department of Human Services reimbursed us on a monthly basis. Contracts do not work well when you are a small agency, and you have a contract that's not reimbursed in a timely manner. Our negative experience came in the form of a welfare work grant in 2000 to 2002. The problem was that it was our intent to use this grant to serve our existing population.

Unfortunately, qualifications were so intense that few in our existing program qualified, and we ended up serving a new population. The second problem was the reimbursement schedule, which was not timely. At one point, we were fronting the government \$16,000, they were 3 months behind in reimbursing us, and I didn't have enough money in the bank for payroll. The third problem is paperwork. You have to have qualified staff who can handle the documentation and the bureaucracy involved, and checks and balances in place to ensure that this documentation is done, before you tack on the responsibility of government money.

The paperwork is immense and repetitive. None of this is to say it should be easier. It is a serious responsibility to be good steward of taxpayer dollars. Faith-based organizations should have to jump through the same hoops and have the same work. Tax dollars should not be spent on promoting religion.

Religious organizations and organizations with religious affiliations should not be exempt from accountability. If organizations want to promote their religion, they should use private funding to do it.

We need to remember that all citizens are guaranteed their civil rights, even if they are poor, uneducated, mentally ill, addicted to drugs, non-Christian or non-White. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Next we have Mr. Ed Anderson, vice president and chief financial officer of Compassion International.

**STATEMENT OF ED ANDERSON, VICE PRESIDENT/CFO,  
COMPASSION INTERNATIONAL**

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the invitation today.

I've been with Compassion for about 25 years now. And our organization takes us to the most difficult living situations, the poorest communities to minister to more than 550,000 children through over 2,500 local church partners in 23 countries.

Each child has a name and a future, and each partner sees a promise within each child. We believe there are four characteristics that set Compassion apart. Our organization is Christ centered, church-based, and committed to integrity.

We partner with local churches to teach, train, and mentor children in a safe environment together with the parents and the community. We directly engage each child as a complete person. We teach the life-changing gospel to every child in a culturally relevant way. And in all of our work, we are committed to the highest professional, financial, and biblical principles.

In addition, Compassion speaks out for children who can't speak up for themselves, informing, motivating, and equipping others to become effective advocates for children.

In the United States, our challenge to advocate for children is aired on our radio program "Speak Up with Compassion" on nearly 500 stations every day. Through efficient and effective child development programs, we enable children to become responsible, fulfilled Christian adults. More than 80 percent of dollars go directly to child development programs. Compassion's field office staff are primarily nationals who speak the local language and understand local culture.

A key to our success and sustainability in our child development programs is that we partner with the local organization that has been in existence for decades, and will continue to be present for generations to come. We partner with the local church. This provides us with a sustainable infrastructure at a very low cost.

Compassion has been recognized by the American Institute of Philanthropy with an A rating, is a member of the Better Business Bureau Wise Giving Alliance, and is a founding member of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability.

In addition, we conduct regular internal and external audits to ensure children are receiving the opportunities and benefits promised.

During Compassion's 52-year history, we've seen many approaches to breaking the cycle of poverty in children's lives, and over the decades we've discovered that changed circumstances rarely change people's lives, while changed people inevitably change their circumstances.

At Compassion, we believe in changing the world one child at a time. Through our leadership development program, qualified young people have the opportunity to attend university in their country and field of their choice.

In addition, these young people are mentored and taught time management, provided spiritual training, and Christian leadership skills. These compassionate children grow up to become leaders and influencers in their own cultures. Changing their communities, their countries, and ultimately the world.

The world's poorest children are often defenseless. Some are brutally forced into labor, others are driven into the sex trade, and still others are coerced into service as soldiers. Children face illiteracy, abuse, and hopelessness at almost every turn.

Never in Compassion's 52-year history have we encountered an enemy with the prospect of totally destroying the God-given potential of millions of the world's children.

That is until now. The HIV/AIDS epidemic threatens millions of African children today. In Africa alone, more than 14 million AIDS orphans are homeless and financially desperate.

We've seen children as young as 8 years old care for themselves and their younger brothers and sisters. No one organization, no one government, and no one strategy by itself can completely address the needs of those affected by AIDS. We call upon every person, every organization, and every government to meet the challenge of this epidemic.

We serve a God of miracles. We believe we can harness human ingenuity and resolve to meet this challenge.

Compassion applauds President Bush and Congress for their historic commitment to reach out to the global community impacted by AIDS, and we urge the President and Congress to release full funding to help our brothers and sisters in Africa impacted by AIDS.

Compassion also congratulates the President and Congress for its important work in the faith-based initiatives. We know that many nonprofits efficiently and effectively use this critical government funding to change and save millions of lives every year.

Despite AIDS, despite poverty, despite the enormous challenges facing today's children, Compassion sees the world as a place of hope, and we see daily how tiny seeds of faith transform the lives of individual children next door in our communities and halfway around the world.



Working together with other nonprofit organizations, church partners, and child sponsors, Compassion will continue to deliver God's promise to each child, and everlasting hope, strong faith, and a bright future. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Anderson follows:]

Subcommittee Statement

Ed Anderson, Sr. Vice President/CFO, Compassion International

1/23/04

Good morning Representatives of the Subcommittee and Fellow Citizens—

Our work takes us to the most difficult living conditions, the poorest communities, and the most desperately needy children in the world. Compassion currently ministers to more than 550,000 children through over 2,500 local church partners in 23 countries around the world. Each child has a name and a future. Each partner sees the promise within each child.

We believe that there are 4 characteristics that set Compassion apart: our organization is Christ-centered, child-focused, church-based and committed to integrity. We partner with local churches to teach, train and mentor children in a safe environment – together with parents and the community. We directly engage each child as a complete person. We teach the life-changing gospel to every child in a culturally relevant way. And in

all of our work, we commit to the highest professional, financial and biblical principles.

In addition, Compassion speaks out for children who cannot speak up for themselves—informing, motivating and equipping others to become effective advocates for children. In the United States our challenge to advocate for children is aired on our radio program “Speak Up with Compassion” on nearly 500 stations every day.

Through efficient and effective child development programs, we enable children to become responsible, fulfilled Christian adults. More than 80% of dollars spent go directly to child development programs. Compassion’s field office staffs are primarily nationals who speak the local languages and understand the local cultures. A key to Compassion’s success and sustainability in our child development programs is that we partner with a local organization that has been in existence for decades and will continue to be present for generations to come. We partner

with the local church. This provides us with a sustainable infrastructure at a very low cost.

Compassion has been recognized by the American Institute of Philanthropy since 1995 with an “A” rating, is a member of the Better Business Bureau Wise Giving Alliance, and is a founding member of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability. In addition, Compassion conducts regular internal and external audits to ensure the children are receiving the opportunities and benefits promised.

During Compassion’s 52-year history, we’ve seen many approaches to breaking the cycle of poverty in children’s lives. Over the decades, we’ve discovered that changed circumstances rarely change people’s lives, while changed people inevitably change their circumstances. At Compassion, we believe in changing the world – one child at a time.

Through our Leadership Development Program, qualified young people have the opportunity to attend a university in their country in a field of their choice. In addition, these young people

are mentored, taught time management, and provided with spiritual training and Christian leadership skills. These Compassion children grow up to become leaders and influencers in their own cultures – changing their communities, their countries, and ultimately, the world.

In Compassion's experience, the world's poorest children are often defenseless, homeless and full of despair. Some are brutally forced into labor, others are driven into the sex trade, and still others are coerced into service as soldiers. Children face illiteracy, abuse, and hopelessness at almost every turn.

But never in Compassion's 52-year history have we encountered an enemy with the prospect of totally destroying the God-given potential of millions of the world's children. That is until now. The HIV/AIDS epidemic threatens millions of African children today. In Africa alone, more than 14 million AIDS orphans are homeless or financially desperate. We have seen children as young as 8 years old caring for themselves and their little brothers and sisters.

No one organization, no one government, and no one strategy by itself can completely address the needs of those affected by AIDS. We call on every person, every organization and every government to meet the challenge of this epidemic. We serve a God of miracles. We believe we can harness human ingenuity and resolve to meet this challenge.

Compassion applauds President Bush and Congress for their historic commitment to reach out to the global community impacted by AIDS. We still urge the President and the Congress to release full funding to help our brothers and sisters in Africa impacted by AIDS.

Compassion also congratulates the President and the Congress for this important work on Faith-Based Initiatives. We know that many non-profit organizations efficiently and effectively use this critical government funding to change—and save—millions of lives each year.

Despite AIDS, despite poverty, despite the enormous challenges facing today's children, Compassion sees the world as a

place of hope. We see daily how tiny seeds of faith transform the lives of individual children –next door in our own communities, and half a world away. Working together with other nonprofit organizations, church partners, and child sponsors, Compassion will continue to deliver God’s promise to each child – an everlasting hope, a strong faith, and a bright future.

Mr. SOUDER. With the Senate passing an appropriations bill, one of the most important categories was for the AIDS funding. We're nowhere near full funding, but at least it's a significant bump up tied directly to the vote yesterday.

Next, Ms. Jackie Jaramillo, executive director of Faith Partners. If you want to give both your general statement and then if you want to make any specific comments, I'll give you a little bit extra time, because I also gave a little bit of time later.

#### **STATEMENT OF JACKIE JARAMILLO, FAITH PARTNERS**

Ms. JARAMILLO. Well, thank you. I'm Jackie Jaramillo, and I represent a coalition of a little over 100 churches in Colorado Springs. And Faith Partners wouldn't exist without—Faith Partners is actually the faith community's response to welfare reform in our community.

Many of us were working, those of us in the faith community, were managing and working with benevolent ministries like West Side Cares and ESM and Catholic charities and Salvation Army. We were working in the community, and we began to read about how welfare reform would be implemented, and how there would be time limits. We felt that the people who were in generations of poverty would really not know where to go after they got cutoff. So we started a dialog with the county to really ask the county what their safety net would be. And as it turned out, that dialog, which took place over an 18-month period of time, turned out that we were trying to discover what our responsibility would be.

We knew that our pockets were not deep enough to sustain people in the way that welfare sustained them. And so at the time, David Burns was the director of the Department of Human Services here locally. And he challenged the churches to find a way to, No. 1, work together.

He didn't want to, there were lots of agencies who had been contractors with the county before. They could have come alongside and formulated some kind of response to help families break the cycle of poverty in their lives. But David Burns was insisting that we work together. And that really was the catalyst that formed the coalition. So we formed a coalition, and we were very inclusive and everybody was invited to the table in the early, beginning stages. In the beginning when we started that dialog, we were Interfaith, and we did have other faiths, non-Christian faiths, at the table in the dialog with us.

In addition to that, I cannot forget to mention the fact that the community was well-represented, because David Burns and many of the people from the community from the government side were also involved in the dialog, and never missed a meeting.

So as we began to formulate our response, we decided that, we came to the conclusion that, the way that we would respond to welfare reform is not with our pocketbook, but with our lives, and that we would provide hope and purpose for families in the community that were trying to break the cycle of poverty in their lives through a monitoring program.

So we developed and we examined mentoring programs from across the country, and we borrowed the best practices from those mentoring programs. I'm sure you've heard about many of them.



Pathfinders in Texas and a lot of others, various, all secular, by the way. And we took the best practices from those, and we've formulated what has now become Faith Partners.

Faith Partners is a faith-in-action program. We do not evangelize. We do not proselytize. We serve anybody who requests our services. It is a ministry of the church itself. The people on the staff provide training to the mentors. We provide training to the families prior to them coming into the program, so that they understand what they're committing to, and then the two form a team.

We have a team approach of four to six mentors that work exclusively with one family for an entire year. We have an evaluation system in place that we started from day one to prove our effectiveness, and we have proven effectiveness in all of the families that we've served.

We've witnessed behavioral changes, attitudinal changes, and economic changes. And so we've taken a very skill-based approach to mentoring these families.

We have a better than 89 percent success rate for the families that we've worked with. And in the 5 years that we've been in existence, we've served over 150 families.

So we believe that what Faith Partners has created in their partnership with the Department of Human Services is a good model. And we believe that it is working, and it is very satisfying work, and we have found a way in which both sides can benefit.

The faith community has their response, in terms of bringing volunteers that provide the mentoring services. And the county, of course, provides the funds for us to operate.

Our funds are a little over 100,000 a year, and they haven't changed significantly over the 5 years that we've been in operation.

I'm a little bit taken aback by the comments of the panelist earlier. I have never heard that you had that kind of reaction to the Bill Moyer show, and I'm really sorry. I'm totally accessible to you, and you could have come to me with those concerns, and I would have been able to explain to you, as I did in my response to Bill Moyer after the show was aired, how disgusted I was with how he twisted and turned and took journalistic liberties on that show.

He actually filmed, his production crew filmed 20 hours of work that Faith Partners did, and he chose to give a show that sort of strapped us with this separation of church and State debate, which was really unfair to the work of Faith Partners and all of the people involved in the partnership locally.

In addition to that, I have two and a half staff people. And with those two, we support over 300 volunteers and 30 families that are being mentored in our program, and we are totally open.

If any congregation, whatever faith they are, come to Faith Partners and want to have a mentoring team, we would embrace that completely. It's part of our constitution. It's part of how we started this, to be very inclusive. And we've never turned away anybody.

It's part of who I am in the community, as well. I represent a lot of churches that really are in conflict with each other theologically, but that's not my concern. I'm working with those individuals who come forth to give of their time to help families break the cycle of poverty in our community.

Bill Moyer had a particular point that he wanted to drive. And in terms of my using the word "covert," I was trying to explain to the interviewer how we were a faith in action, and not evangelical. We were not evangelical in our approach to working families. And I was talking about a book that was written that was called the Kindness Conspiracy.

It's written by an author, and it talks in that book about how Christians are very uncomfortable speaking and talking to somebody else about their faith, but they are not uncomfortable with acts of kindness. So he took that conversation completely out of context. That was an off-the-record conversation we were having, and he threw a question at me during the interview, which brought that word "covert" up again. And so I actually used the word "conspiracy" not "covert." And it's a conspiracy of kindness, and it's what all of us operate under. We all are in the work that we are in for the acts of kindness that we give and that gives our faith purpose. It gives us purpose. And so end of story.

Anybody who wants to contact me and know further what that interview was all about, I'm totally willing to spend time explaining the true intent of Faith Partners and what we're trying to accomplish in the community. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Thank you. Our clean-up panelist for today is Mr. Bob Cote, executive director of Step 13 in Denver.

#### STATEMENT OF BOB COTE, STEP 13, DENVER, CO

Mr. COTE. Yes, my name is Bob Cote.

Mr. SOUDER. That's the English pronunciation, Cote (pronouncing)?

Mr. COTE. Bill collectors say that. I started Step 13 20 years ago, because I was an alcoholic. And I look out my office at the bar, Los Compadres, where I poured out half a fifth of vodka, which at that time would have probably took five good men to get away from me.

And at that time, I was beginning to realize that I was committing suicide on the installment plan. And I went from making \$100,000 a year to drinking on skid row. But there was a rhyme and reason. I got to know all those men down there, and I started running a restaurant for \$450 a month. And I made the deal with the board of directors that we would never take any Federal, State, or city moneys. Never solicit for United Way money, Season to Share money. That we're going to do it on our own. If it was meant to be, it would be. And that was 20 years ago, and we're here. So we've done pretty well.

Our budget is around \$480,000 a year. We raise 50 percent of that. We have three in-house businesses. We're two blocks from Coors Field. I have an auto detailing car wash business. And during the Rockies season, we're pretty busy. I pay them \$10 an hour.

All of my staff consists of residents of Step 13, with the exception of one. I have a young lady that helps me administratively. And I believe it takes a duck to deal with a duck. If you have a fox start dealing around with some ducks, you've got a problem. And we have a lot of that in this country.

And I think what we're leaving out of this, I believe you mentioned Marvin Okasky and Bob Woodson, and what happens, and

this has been going on for years, everyone says programs are faith-based and community-based, but nobody says community-based. It all says faith-based, and everybody gets jacked out of shape. "Uh-oh, we're going to be dunking them in a tank of water," and doing this and that and whatever.

I'm not a minister. I named Step 13 Step 13 because of Jesus and the 12 apostles, and the original 13 colonies. God and country. That is what did it for this guy. Because I was invited to the White House 7 years after I poured that vodka bottle out. What other country could that happen in, or could you envision to have this vision in your mind and have this work?

Our success rate is 39 percent. But I'm not dealing with all the boys. I'm dealing with hard-core drug and alcoholics that have been on the street 10 years, 15 years.

And you mentioned Pastor Freddie Garcia down in San Antonio or Houston. And I've known him for many, many years, through Robert Woods and the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise. And when Newt Gingrich was the speaker of the House, we used to meet with him once every 4 months. And we've brought up all of these things that I've been saying.

Here today, years later, we're still doing it. But I think it comes from, why don't you give vouchers? John Walter spoke about this a couple months ago. And I believe that Congress has approved it, and that they're waiting for the House, or they're waiting for the Senate, but it was a couple of hundred million dollars for alcohol and drug treatment.

I have a church. It's not mandatory. And I've had Rabbis there. I've had priests there. I've had Mormons there. Whatever. I rotate them. And they act as mentors.

They don't have to go to the church. They can go instead to the meeting room downstairs and watch a 4-hour Father Martin movie or go to the church and listen to the music or whatever.

And the tickets to the Rockies have been very good to us and so on and so forth. But I truly believe that vouchers would be the answer. What would be the difference if a Catholic went to a Baptist shelter or whatever? And "shelter," I don't like that word. We shelter horses and cows and things like that. We should do more for people.

And I don't have a time limit. The longest I've had someone stay there is 3 years. But they have to get a bank account, and there's a pecking order. And we're in the process of purchasing an apartment house for the next step.

But faith-based, that's a great idea. Catholic Charities, Mary Bolan, at one of those congressional hearings, she said, "If we have to adhere to these rules, then we're not going to accept any government money."

Well, I beg your pardon. Two-thirds of their budget nationally comes from the Federal budget. They don't want anyone—it's like territorial. And that's the problem.

This isn't that complicated. You know, I think we're all here to help people, you know? And there's always a barrier or an "if," or you're a right-wing, mean-spirited Christian fanatic. And I'll take that.

Is it mean-spirited to ask someone that's ruined his life drinking, with drugs and alcohol to get his act together and go to work and take care of himself and be responsible for his actions? To ask children to stop having children. Is that mean-spirited? I don't think so.

If it is, I'll take it. But we have to get real, and we go around and around and around. And you're going to another city. Let's just put the hammer down and say, "Let's try it."

We have this President at this time, and I don't think we're going to get this chance again. While the President is in office, you and I know that Senator Samtorum, who I talked to in the first year he was elected—I testified before his subcommittee. Senator Cohen was President Clinton's Secretary of State. But we got something done.

See, there's three kinds of lies: Statistics, statistics, no, lies, lies, and statistics. And people know these numbers all over the place. And we need to be accountable.

If you're going to get faith-based funding, then you need to be accountable for every person and what happens with that person, and stop shooting numbers all over the place. Be honest, and I think it will work.

We're not talking a lot. Why not give it a chance? If we're wrong, we'll take our medicine. If the other side is wrong, I doubt they'll take theirs.

I see the red light. This faith-based bird, say it's a bird. You've got the left wing flapping 90 miles an hour, and the right wing has got a little crazy glue on it with a little feather, and not quite get going. So the bird is never going to get off the ground. So what are we going to do.

We've got to get the left and the right wings flapping together, and let's get this thing going and help some people and do some good. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony. Very diverse testimony.

And let me just lay out a couple of general comments to try to fill in the blanks before I start with a process of some questions.

Let me make just a couple of things clear, because I've been working with this issue since the early 1980's. So let me put it in a little bit of historical context, so we don't have to revisit some points in the debate.

First off, faith-based initiatives are not new. And here's why. They've historically given to groups that didn't direct faith as part of their delivery of services.

In other words, some of what we've talked about is as long as you don't overtly share your faith as part of those services, there's never really been a question.

And one of the fundamental questions I'm going to ask is how is that different than a Christian working for the welfare department? Because there have been Christians, Jews, Muslims who have worked for the welfare department. So what makes a faith-based ministry that doesn't have faith as part of it different than a secular ministry manned by people of faith?

The next question is the first expansion to kind of faith-based ministries, where they shared their faith, where we got into the

legal question of could you have a crucifix posted? Could you have a collar? Could you share a prayer. Could you start sharing with your faith with somebody and not lose your grant? That came largely through the pressures of Bob Woodson and Jack Kemp under President Reagan.

Because at that point, hardly anybody would deliver those social services, except people who viewed a higher value to eternal rather than present.

And so all of a sudden, grants went out from HUD to overtly religious groups with no questions asked, because nobody else would provide the services.

Something similar started happening with homelessness. It's clear Congress will never appropriate enough money for homelessness. And without overtly religious groups being part of the homelessness problem, there wasn't going to be an ability to meet that.

So grants have gone out in the homeless area and the AIDS area long before there were overt pieces of legislation to address the faith-based organizations. Then we started to expand that into other categories. When the Republicans took over Congress with welfare reform, that was the first initiative where faith-based groups were coming into more traditional source type of things, where you start running into, "There's a limited pot. Should some of this pot be diversified."

We passed it on welfare reform. It passed in the House under Rick Laslow's committee when we first took over Congress. We passed in the House at least five other bills.

I think, as I mentioned, I believe four became law. And the restrictions got narrower and narrower.

For example, as we started in the education committee to deal with some of the things, when you're dealing with the Head Start program, it's a little different than other things. So we had to have—you couldn't have prayer any closer—the amendment that I agreed to was any closer than 5 minutes before it started. So there was a clear break, so nobody was made to feel uncomfortable. You couldn't have prayer during the session, so there would be no proselytizing.

The Head Start program was the Head Start program, but that doesn't mean that the people that were running the program didn't have, "a covert part of that." They were reaching out and covering part of their mission with their behavior and their religion.

But there are different rules depending, and fundamentally, on the faith-based things, that we get this clarified. Unless there's choice, unless a recipient has a choice of services, there won't be government funding that allows any direct involvement of religion.

Except where nobody's providing services, that becomes a different challenge. And that's where we're getting into some of these international questions. We're starting to explore that, because if nobody else is delivering it, do you treat it differently?

You can't, if you have government money, discriminate on who's receiving it. You can't do that. Now, one debate is can you put any conditions on it? But you can't say, in other words, they have to attend a talk. You can't say, "You have to be a Christian. You have to be a Muslim. You can't be a Jew." You can't do that with government funds. These things are agreed on. There are already court

rules. So we've got a much narrower debate that's occurring here. Now, as we move into areas, and this is why we constantly have these hearings, to the frustration of the grass roots movement. I'm going to go through and sort out here how we're going to go through the questioning process.

But let me just say that part of the reason—let me give you a couple of political comments, so when you hear followup discussion on this, you can put this in context.

Some of the problem is here that, I remember we had a meeting with Steve Goldsmith when he was putting together this initiative for President Bush, when Governor Bush was still running for President. And he said, "Why is this so hard getting this through Congress."

Let me tell you, Democratic constituencies are less amenable to faith-based organizations than to overtly religious organizations. And Republican Congressmen and Senators tend to represent suburban and rural groups, not urban ministries.

Therefore, there is no overt constituency that is in Washington that says, "How do we reach the poor through faith-based organizations?" And the faith-based has a pattern, though Focus on the panel said they didn't want it, neither do lots of the other big ministries want direct government funding.

That's not what this was designed for. But it's been very hard, because, bluntly put, when many Republicans figured out this wasn't going to be money going to their districts, they were less enthusiastic about it. And the Democrats weren't backing it from the beginning, with very few exceptions. So it's been very hard to move it through, except piecemeal. But people like myself who have been backing it from the beginning believe that contrary to statements that groups have been eligible for years, because of the government bureaucracy, Black and Hispanic groups particularly in America, who live in the neighborhoods, have not been part of the process.

Getting them to be part of the process requires some minimal investment of government funds and capital. And, quite frankly, we have a bill that's co-sponsored by Jerry Nadler, Bobby Scott, Chet Edwards, Barney Frank, who support the compassion capital idea, as long as they aren't getting government funds and aren't able to receive government funds with it.

In other words, part of it is to build the capacity of groups like Step 13 to go to private foundations to get the money, not just government funds. And in the context of tens of billions of dollars, putting some money into developing the capacity of organizations that are often unheard, which is what Mr. Cote was referring to.

You heard a long-time frustrated example of, "We don't even know how to get included in the process of the United States. We're too busy working out in the street, and we don't know how to go about it."

Steve Goldsmith, who is Jewish, did these initiatives in Indianapolis, because he didn't know how. He knew he wasn't going to get any more tax revenue. He didn't know how to meet the revenues. He said, "Any comer that wants to do this, come on board. We don't know what to do about homelessness. We don't know what to do about health care."

And the challenge in front of us is, is there enough room at the table that, in some form, faith-based groups can be included. And I want to reiterate, as I did in the first panel, there are tax breaks we already agreed with. We have that in Federal law. Compassion capital fund is more debateable. What the administration is currently doing through Executive order with some of the grants is even more debateable. And, quite frankly, it's headed for pork.

It's just where the decision is going to be, and where it's going to go, because there's a little bit more. Because for some of them, there are choices, and for some of them, there aren't. And then there's another category where the voucher word is almost as controversial as saying an overt Jesus Christ word.

The voucher word in Congress is about as debated as you can get. But nevertheless, this is a different ballgame when there's a clear choice of somebody with a voucher. But that requires there to be program choices. Because a voucher for Head Start doesn't work in eastern Colorado where there may only be one Head Start center in several hundred miles. So we clearly have to, as we work through the voucher question, work this through.

Now, with that as kind of a background of what we're doing, I want to establish, first off, Mr. Tollefson, let me ask you a question. Does your organization provide social services?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Only in the work we do. And we do not discriminate on any basis.

Mr. SOUDER. But you provide social service.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No, we do. The services we provide to are to families who are in some celebration. It might be a memorial service, it might be christening, it might be a wedding, it might be some kind of counseling.

Mr. SOUDER. But you do provide counseling or some kind of services? It's not just a meeting services.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to make sure.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. And I have a response to your question.

Mr. SOUDER. I didn't have a question yet. My question was—

Mr. TOLLEFSON. What makes them different than social services.

Mr. SOUDER. I'm going to come to that question in a minute. First I wanted to establish that you all provide some sort of services.

My first question is an assumption. And rather than taking a long time with each answer, I just want to correctly see if I identified that.

Mr. Whetstone, for Feed the Children, hiring practices and ability to openly share your faith would be a problem if you couldn't do it?

Mr. WHETSTONE. Not necessarily.

Mr. SOUDER. It depends on the type of program that you're particularly involved in.

Mr. WHETSTONE. Absolutely. We recognize the diversity of faith. It's a holistic approach.

Mr. SOUDER. So, for example, if you were doing a food bank, you could theoretically set up a food bank where you would hire people of different faiths in your food bank.

Mr. WHETSTONE. Absolutely.

Mr. SOUDER. You could have a Muslim working in that food bank and distributing food, and that would be considered. Because you don't require a statement of faith from all employees.

Mr. WHETSTONE. That's exactly right.

Mr. SOUDER. But as a mission, your primary mission, for example, if somebody wanted to be on your board of directors, or part of your corporation, do you presume that they have a Christian mission in that?

Mr. WHETSTONE. I think it's part of the Christian mission. And having a heart for service as we're taught in the Bible.

Mr. SOUDER. So would you function with a board that was majority non-Christian.

Mr. WHETSTONE. We don't, but we could.

Mr. SOUDER. So your organization, I would put in the mixed forum. We would have to identify that more clearly.

And as I understand, Mr. Tollefson, you would require a statement of faith.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Absolutely not. The issue is not whether they conform to my faith, but what is their sense of the sacred. That's what's really important. Because people do have different views of what that is.

Some will follow Jesus. Others will follow Buddha. Others will follow the natural path of nature. The issue is what is sacred, and not just materialistic.

Mr. SOUDER. But that is your opinion of the issue.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That's who I serve and what I would not expect.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Littrell, my understanding is you would have openness as to who would be on. There wouldn't be a requirement of a statement of faith?

Ms. LITTRELL. There's no requirement for anybody.

Mr. SOUDER. And, Reverend Cowles, in your organization, would you have an overt statement of faith about any organizations you had?

Rev. COWLES. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. So you have some organizations that don't? For example, would you be able to segregate. Conservatives have complained about this for years. That Planned Parenthood will get Federal funding, even though it's banned for abortions.

They'll get abortion counseling in one section, and non-abortion counseling in another section. So anybody that argues that religious organizations shouldn't have that spread, will also cutoff Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

Because, in fact, if you have separate divisions, you allow that to occur. But you're saying you would have a consistent statement of faith.

Rev. COWLES. Our ministry hires their own people, but I can speak for them that the majority of their leadership would have definitely a statement of belief. And, in fact, most of them hire right out of their own congregations.

But further on down the line, cooks and helpers and janitors, you know, no. Many of them hire, in fact, lots of people hire people that come to their program from whatever background they come from.

Mr. SOUDER. It probably depends on what the mission is.



Rev. COWLES. And whether their job description is critical to the ongoing leadership and development and strategy of the organization.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Robinson, my understanding is you wouldn't have a statement of faith.

Ms. ROBINSON. No.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. We do.

Mr. SOUDER. You do?

Ms. Jaramillo, my understanding is you had a broader—as far as this particular program?

Ms. JARAMILLO. That's correct. We do not have a statement of faith. We have core values. And as long as the people who apply for work with us embrace these core values, that is good for us. And these core values are all related to how we treat the families.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Cote, what would your position be?

Mr. COTE. We don't care what they are. We don't have a statement. We just take whoever the best person is.

Mr. SOUDER. If somebody was an atheist, would they be part of your staff?

Mr. COTE. Just about every guy that comes in there is an atheist.

Mr. SOUDER. I don't mean the people that you serve. I mean the people that counsel.

Mr. COTE. I don't have any counselors and therapists, because if counseling and therapy worked, they wouldn't need Step 13. They lead by example.

I do not have a time limit. Somebody that comes in there out of the gutter, and he's buying a 2-year-old car, and he's got \$5,000 in the bank, and he's got a loan to pay back. I made a deal with Wells Fargo.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you have any paid staff?

Mr. COTE. None of them make less than \$20,000 a year.

Mr. SOUDER. So your organization is nothing like a traditional hierarchal organization because of the way you use them at the Rockies game and other things? In effect, your staff is going to be much more diverse, your key people are going to share your shared mission and vision of the guy coming in, but he would still be paid staff.

Mr. COTE. All of my staff are either ex-addicts or drunks or what have you. And it takes a duck to know a duck. And if I took government funds, I'd have to have some foxes sitting around, and then my ducks would get all upset.

Mr. SOUDER. So we have an illustration of the diverse hiring approaches. And without changes in the law, at least two groups wouldn't be directly eligible without some structural changes or separate 501(c)3 to move it.

Your group, which you don't want the funds, but, for example, if the government had an excess building somewhere in the area of your ministry, would you be interested in having your organization be able to bid for that? In other words, to claim if for whatever back taxes are, or just claim the building.

Mr. COTE. I thought about that. But someone earlier was talking about vacant government buildings. With the Stuart McKinney Act, I get flyers from, I think it's the General Services Administra-

tion. And at the old Stapleton, no, Lowry, when they converted that over, nonprofits got first choice.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. What I proposed earlier and what I said came about. We take what's in the homelessness act, and apply it to other kinds of programs, such as drug treatment, juvenile delinquency, and other types of things.

Mr. COTE. I think that's great. And I think faith-based organizations should be—I know a lot of them that are small. It's a mom and pop organization. They don't know how to write a grant. They don't have computer skills. And maybe you could direct some of, instead of the funding, just some experience and some help.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me go back to my question and start with Mr. Tollefson.

How would you delineate that a faith-based organization is faith-based, if there is no statement of faith in that mission? And how does it differ from a person of faith who works for a welfare office?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Well, first of all, the difference for me is whether there's proselytizing versus personal choice or personal decision. When people are in trouble, they need to make some decisions about themselves. And when you're giving them the answer, that may not be their answer.

Mr. SOUDER. But that's not the question I asked. The question is, that's true for the welfare department too, right?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. They would not proselytize.

Mr. SOUDER. So how does someone who has a so-called faith-based ministry who's providing ministries differ from somebody of faith that's working at the welfare department?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. What this lady said and what that lady said.

Mr. SOUDER. How is that different?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. You live your faith. You don't preach it.

Mr. SOUDER. But you do that at the welfare department.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If that staff member were in my organization, they would be fired yesterday. Because social services are to do the work that this gentleman is talking about. Do the work. Find the place to live. Get the food. How do your children get the shots? Help them to live their life, and to help them organize that.

And there are a lot of conceptions that we can use that will help us do that.

Mr. SOUDER. But whatever, first of all, if it doesn't have faith, and it's not part of the faith-based discussion.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. SOUDER. First off, let me clarify. You don't believe that people of faith who work for government entities aren't doing a good service?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes, many of them are. But they don't do it when they wear their religion on their sleeve.

Mr. SOUDER. But that's not the question I asked. How does a person of faith who's doing a good service by working in the local homeless department who's distributing immunization shots differ from a faith-based organization where they also don't talk about their faith and do a good service by doing immunizing? What is the difference between those two people living it, not talking about it?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Well, I would say being competent. I'd like to say—

Mr. SOUDER. But you're not saying government people aren't competent.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. There are some that aren't.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, there are some in the private sector that aren't also.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Of course. If your faith is vibrant, it seems to me that you would really work at being competent. Ever more competent. It's like the counselor trainer said at a Christian related university. He said, "If you have a choice between a Christian counselor and a good counselor, choose the good counselor." That makes sense. See, it's competence.

Mr. SOUDER. Yeah, I don't—even though—

Mr. TOLLEFSON. And if your faith is vibrant—

Mr. SOUDER. I'm not comfortable having the record say—I believe we can do a better job of delivering social services, but I don't think it's fair to say that government employees aren't competent.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I'm not saying that.

Mr. SOUDER. But if competence is the only measure—

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Competence comes from a lot of directions, sir.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me ask Ms. Littrell the same question.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yeah, please.

Ms. LITTRELL. Well, I don't believe that anybody is more or less competent because of their faith or because of their expression of faith. I believe their competence is because of their education and their experience. And so I would say that you can be—the people in my organization all have faith. They just don't have to tell somebody about their faith.

Mr. SOUDER. I understand that part. But that's not what my question is. I understand you don't feel they need to tell them. So how are you different from somebody who shares your faith that's working for the welfare department?

Ms. LITTRELL. We're not.

Mr. SOUDER. So why would you call yourself a faith-based organization, other than a social service?

Ms. LITTRELL. First of all, we work with a lot of churches. We really are a community-based organization, rather than faith-based. We really are not a ministry.

Mr. SOUDER. That's important. Because there are government entities. There are nonprofit entities which are all-inclusive. There are community-based organizations, which one of the things that I like to keep threatening to put in, and everybody panics, is the ZIP code test.

So at least a fair percentage of the people live in the neighborhood when they get the grant. But nobody seems to want to touch it. And then groups that have a component to it that's more faith-based, and I'm trying to sort out here which groups are faith-based, where there's a faith component, and whether that makes them different than government. Because that's what part of the debate is.

You all are already eligible. That isn't the question. It is, are groups where faith is a component either in a set-up where it's kind of what I would term there, but less direct—in many cases, like the like Feed the Children and Mr. Cote, where they would say—I don't want to put words in your mouth. Is this a correct statement? Because we've had this come up in different hearings.

Even though you don't require a statement of faith, you would say that the reflection—you would still refer to it as a ministry?

Mr. WHETSTONE. Yes, sir. Absolutely.

Mr. SOUDER. And what you're saying is part of God's call, as Keith Phillips said, is there's a service side to the poor and to the hungry, not to just save a soul?

Mr. WHETSTONE. That's exactly right.

Mr. SOUDER. And, therefore, there is a service. There is a ministry.

Mr. WHETSTONE. And, in fact, that's a component of a host of the religions around the world today. Not just Christianity.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes and no.

Ms. LITTRELL. It seems like it's really difficult to describe, to differentiate between what is a ministry doing the work of social services, and what is an organization doing the work of social services.

And, you know, it might not—you have to have some kind of a statement of faith, but it's not a statement of religious faith. It's a statement of faith that we can get the job done, because of what we do, and because we have a desire to help people, and because we're good people, and we're do-gooders and all of that sort of thing.

Mr. SOUDER. I don't believe that's a correct analysis of the program. We had this come up at one of our other hearings. A faith that isn't defining is not the dictionary definition of faith.

In other words, faith that there are mountains because I can look out there and see it is not what this public debate is about. This is about whether or not you can have faith in a power higher than an individual, and whether groups that believe that should be eligible for government funding.

And if you don't believe that, that's fine, but that's a different position than whether there's a faith-based position.

Ms. LITTRELL. And I think it's the articulation of the faith.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me move to a couple of other people now. Reverend Cowles, give your view on it.

Rev. COWLES. I think I can illustrate your question in a quick story. Darrell, who's an alcoholic, came to the food ministry, got an apartment. He came to his church meetings. He gave his life to Jesus Christ. Wants a higher power.

Darrell called me yesterday morning and said, "Pastor Dean, my first day on the job is today. Would you pray for me?" And of course I did.

Carolyn in our church works for social services, but he could not have called her at her office that morning and asked her to pray for him, I assume, because if she was found praying over the phone on government time, I would assume that would bring a problem. Not because she doesn't care as much for Darrell as I do, but because of her limitation in her workplace.

She could not provide that. I could, because there were no restrictions on me. And I think that is why faith-based organizations that we work with are very successful. Because they can devote their full time, and don't have to dance around that. It's effective. And Darrell got to work, and he came back and called me afterwards and said, "I kept my first day on the job, and I'm sober." So I think you can do it more overtly in a faith-based organization.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me ask, Ms. Littrell raised another issue, Mr. Cote, that was almost directly opposite of what you said a little bit ago. She believed that people who are eligible for, she didn't even say "eligible." She said people are more effective if they have the appropriate education and training. Do you agree with that.

Mr. COTE. In some ways. Like I say, my staff consists of, I've seen guys that, I can think of one right offhand. He has a hard time speaking English, so I put him on the front desk. He wasn't the best person I could put up there, but it helped him, and he worked through his fear of the phones.

Mr. SOUDER. This really came up in San Antonio in the debate, because one of the men, even though we were at Freddie Garcia's place, said Freddie's people shouldn't be talking to drug addicts, because they don't have any training to work with drug addicts. In fact, that whole Victory Life Fellowship program all through Texas was nearly decertified under the Governor of Texas, not named Bush, because even though they granted a mental health division, and it was the most effective single program that ever existed in the United States for getting people off the street, the fact is they didn't have licensed counselors.

Mr. COTE. And they tried that in the Houston challenge and Bob Woodson and myself and Roger went to the Alamo. Because they were trying to put Freddie out of business for decertification.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you basically agreed with my suggestion, I know Bob initially did, on the ZIP code? You're suggesting that there's something else that's effective in the community, other than just having a college degree or certification?

Mr. COTE. You have to personalize it. I don't go for this some places taking a number. I was with Marvin in a shelter in Austin, and I wanted to see someone, and they called it D17 or whatever it was. And that's so depersonalizing and dehumanizing or whatever.

I call everyone Mister. That's what they're called at our shelter. And I have as my staff either the residents or former residents. Again, because I say, it takes a duck to know a duck. They've walked right where they walked. Who better to know how to relate to them than someone that's been there.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Souder, may I ask to be excused, please? I have a grandson that needs my attention.

Mr. SOUDER. Sure. And I skipped over, do you want to make any closing comments before you leave?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes. I think you would be stronger in your position to advance the services of churches and synagogues and temples and other places if you would refer to this as religion-based, not faith-based. Because when you get into faith, you get into issues of chosen-ness, and the Belief. And it becomes exclusivist and destructive.

So if you could refer to it as religion-based, I think it would be stronger.

My apologies, sir, for leaving, but I'm going to pay attention to my grandson.

Mr. SOUDER. I appreciate that. And let me assure you, as we work through this, that one of the things that has come up, and

this needs to be understood, as I've told people originally in the administration, I said, "I don't think this is going to work."

I have one area of my hometown that is where the main housing complex is. It's half Bosnians, which is Muslim, and half Burmese, which is largely Buddhist. And if there had been a, quote, faith-based organization, and they had either bowed to Allah or had some kind of a tribute to Buddha, the community would have exploded if somebody senior had been in that area that was a Christian.

If we do this in Federal funding, everybody, including Orthodox Jews, who are very rigid in their beliefs, or Muslims, when we get into this area, this is causing a lot of consternation. The direct government funding. But it's these kind of discussions that are helpful. Thank you for participating. I'd be happy to excuse you.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Thank you. It's been my pleasure.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to ask you, Mr. Anderson, you've been listening to some of this. You have a statement of faith, as well. Do you think that people, because in some of the organizations, clearly, I'll have to ask Ms. Robinson next to comment.

But in her organization and Ms. Littrell's organization, as I understand it, they would welcome people that don't necessarily share their statement of faith. And they presumably get volunteers where that isn't necessarily the driving issue.

Would your organization, if that wasn't the driving issue, would you get the volunteers to be able to administer it in the same way? Or is it so intertwined as part of who you are, who gives you the money, and who gives you the support, that you can't really separate it for those who say, "Why you can't separate it?"

Mr. ANDERSON. For us, that can't be separated. And I think I'm hearing some confusion between an individual's statement of faith and an organization's statement of faith.

Individuals can be believers in different environments, secular and nonprofit and religious organizations, and express their faith and live with their values. But what we're talking about here is faith-based organizations.

And for Compassion, the integration of sharing values, of sharing beliefs as a part of ministering to and taking care of the needs of children around the world is completely integrated.

All of our donor base, I would say 95 to 98 percent of our donor base are people of faith. So for us to then try to segregate and say these are activities with faith components and these are activities which aren't really wouldn't work in our organization.

Mr. SOUDER. And do you believe part of the power of your organization is that commitment of faith?

Mr. ANDERSON. Absolutely. It goes to the core of our belief of what we're trying to cure, in terms of poverty around the world.

Many organizations meet the needs of what we would call symptoms of poverty through food, clothing, medical needs.

We do the same. But to ignore the component of a spiritual aspect of someone's life we believe is missing a large component of what poverty is all about.

Mr. SOUDER. And one of the common things we've heard at the hearings, as well as outside and particularly from media debates

is that, well, if had you an overt goal to evangelize, that should be done with purely private funds, and that's a different goal.

But part of the problem here is that this is the goal of church on Sunday mornings, and evangelizing ministries, such as Campuses for Christ, the four-step plan to give your soul, from a Christian perspective. Clearly other groups evangelize. But this isn't evangelizing, per se. It's dealing with the spiritual. But it's part of a mix that's also helping people who are hurting, reaching out in the social service side without parking the spiritual over in this corner.

The specific question is, can it be in the public arena, other than outside the church building in straight evangelism? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. We really are fully integrated. I think our society is trying to say, can we compartmentalize a faith component in a doing well and doing good component? And if you study the philosophy of how we believe people develop, those things can't be separated.

So for us, that would be very difficult.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Robinson, when you hear some of what we've just said, and clearly the Methodist tradition was mixed. John Wesley would have shared that view. Leadership kind of varies church by church. We have a lot in my district that would have a somewhat similar view.

How do you say to people like that say you ought to stay out of any arena that involves direct government funding or any kind of delineated funding? You can't even have inadvertent proselytizing with indirect government funding. Should they not be able to have part of the program?

Should Catholic schools not be allowed to have a bus, as opposed to educating? Which right now they can't have a bus, and they can't get moneys for the teachers. The Supreme Court rules the computer is nonsectarian. The software is sectarian.

Should they be able to bid on an abandoned building, even if they have an overt religious message? Do you favor tax deductions?

Ms. ROBINSON. I don't have a problem with separating programs. I think it's hard for me to really understand how you can't, because we always have. So I've never, even though we're Methodist, there was never any intention on promoting religion in our organization.

I mean, what happened was in 1981, they saw a need, and we opened the food pantry in a church basement.

A few years later, they saw a need with ex-offenders getting jobs. We opened a job center in another church basement. Soon we moved into one building. And it was never a part.

We really address common sense basic needs for people. And religion is just not part of that. The people who come to us are in such crisis, they don't even talk about religion.

And for myself, what I witness in our organization is when people get stabilized and don't have that crisis pending is when they will ask you, "Do you know a good church I can go to?" Or, "This is my interest. Can you tell me which church in this area that I live in might be a good place for me to go to?" And that's as far as it goes.

And we might not even refer them to a Methodist church. We don't have any kind of—

Mr. SOUDER. Now, that's your view. What I'm curious about is what do you think of other people at the table who don't have that same view? Should they be shut out.

Ms. ROBINSON. I think everybody here does good work. And I think everybody here does work that is needed in communities. But there has to be a distinction between someone who says, "You need to go to this church service and then I'll give you a meal."

Mr. SOUDER. So do you favor the tax deductions for these groups.

Ms. ROBINSON. I don't know that I understand the tax deductions.

Mr. SOUDER. Currently if you write a donation to a church, you get a tax deduction.

Ms. ROBINSON. Because that's a personal choice. I'm choosing to send my money to Step 13.

Mr. SOUDER. So you would support where nonitemizers could give money to—

Ms. ROBINSON. Sure.

Mr. SOUDER. What about Compassion Capital funds, where groups that aren't going to receive government money, like Mr. Cotes or Mr. Anderson, if he had a local affiliate, could go in and learn how to set up these different organizations, that could then do it for private philanthropy?

Ms. ROBINSON. I have mixed feelings about that. I believe in capacity building. Obviously, DenUM has had a lot to do with that in the last 20 years. But I have a problem with redirecting direct service money.

We have huge needs in Colorado for child care. If we're going to have 10 recipients go back to work for 20 hours and possibly up to 40 hours in the reauthorization bill, we've got to pay for child care for that. And I have a hard time diverting \$30,000 for somebody to go to learn computer skills when you can go to your library to learn that.

I learned on-line skills at the library. I don't know. It's hard for me to say, "Yeah, that is well worth it," particularly when our clients at DenUM, more than 70 percent of them, are in some kind of government program. So old-age pension, Social Security, disability, some kind of housing, some kind of government assistance. And that's not enough.

We're always going to need programs with community programs, or if you choose to go to one of faith, whatever works for the client.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me throw out another statement, and then, Mr. Cowles, you've worked with this a lot, and you're sitting on the review panel, so I'd like to hear your reaction to this.

As somebody who's been involved in and out of government as a staffer in the Senate and as a Member of Congress, what's become clear to me in local volunteering communities is it doesn't matter whether the Republicans or the Democrats are in power. The social spending is flat.

People can claim that it's a partisan issue, but the fact is social welfare spending is an inflation adjuster in almost all categories, except for AIDS funding, breast cancer, and things like that.



In general, they're not anxious to promote tax increases. Education always gets money, whatever the latest disease is gets money, and when we have war and national security, we have financial demands.

So we're looking at relatively flat spending. We're looking at flat funding. Nevertheless, the problems seem to be getting greater. Part of the idea is to try to get other groups involved, some of whom may or may not be more effective, because they can deal with it holistically. Because at least a segment of the groups believe by dealing with it, there are medical results, like we heard on the first panel, and otherwise.

And domestically, this is most directly related to those who don't have resources. In other words, in the suburban communities, they theoretically go to the private sector and raise funds. And then take the United States and go internationally.

We can't even begin to address the AIDS question if there weren't more groups like Compassion arguing out there. And, to me, if they get excluded from the debate, that leverage is lost on those of us who are voting in Congress. Or Feed the Children.

If Feed the Children wasn't out in the world right now—do you know what percentage of the United States is providing the most world aid right now?

Mr. WHETSTONE. It's more than 80 percent.

Mr. SOUDER. And if we didn't have that, and we exclude these groups, the world would roughly collapse. And my concern and some of the recent debate is we're actually going backward. That some of these funds that have been going back to the various groups are going to be tightened up.

You've been sitting in looking at the applications, you've worked on it in Indianapolis. You've now been in Denver. How do you see some of what's sorting through here?

Rev. COWLES. The funding is flat. I don't think the direct subsidies are going to work any longer. We've tried that. We've seen it. It's not going to work. It's going to work when local groups get together.

We've long advocated this approach to the intermediary, to the capacity building, and it's wonderful it's finally happening with this President. Of course, it's \$26 million the first round and \$30 million the next. But it is working. Dr. Ashton is here from VJVA who got part of the capital fund in Colorado. And she's working with 361 organizations. Mine is one of them, Crossroads of the Rockies. Welfare moms, crack addicts get computer skills to become grant writers. They never did that before, and they've lifted them up.

And bang for the buck in stewardship is another key thing for me. This money, this \$26 million that we have authorized spread across the country, did far more. And Bobby Polejo would tell you story after story after story of organizations that have benefited directly by increasing their ability to see funding from the private sector, from individuals.

Which really, like I said in my opening statement, all came before the great welfare society came about.

Not to say government isn't responsible to do things. I'm not advocating that. But I am saying that this kind of approach is cost

effective, and it reaches the most people for the least amount of money, and it increases the organizations like Faith Partners.

\$100,000 and two staff members are doing all of that great stuff they're doing. \$100,000 in government bureaucracies are gone in a toilet seat on a B1 bomber. So we're very, very excited to see this kind of thing happening.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Jaramillo, do you have lots of small organizations in your coalition too? And were they included before? Could you describe a little more in-depth your Faith Partners group?

Ms. JARAMILLO. Faith Partners was basically the church leadership. It includes the evangelical line, as well as the main line that operate downtown and serve groups like the homeless, and EA Sam, and all of those groups.

But when we first started, we started with a dialog of how we were going to respond to welfare reform in our community. And we really felt that there was a spiritual component to breaking the cycle of poverty. Any good welfare administrator could lower the caseload of any FAFDC caseload or TANIF caseload. But to really help those families escape, in terms of leveling the playing field for those individuals, we knew that it was going to take more than just a handout.

Many people in churches are so tired of feeding the same people for 15 years. You feed the same families coming to the soup kitchens. And you get to know them like they're your neighbors, because they become familiar with you.

If you work in those ministries, you see the same people over and over again. So what you're doing is you're alleviating the suffering of poverty, but you're really not breaking the cycle. And in order to do that, we knew we had to give of ourselves. Pour out who we were. We're not trying to make them like us. What we've learned in the mentoring process is the person who's changed the most at the end of the mentoring term are the mentors, not the families. Because we have learned so much about surviving, and about the whole system of welfare, and our mentors become the strongest advocates for these individuals.

And we have both—one of the positive things that came out of the Bill Moyer show was we made a strong commitment to seeking mentors in secular organizations, like Rotarian clubs and lots of different clubs. So we are in the process of developing teams, mentoring teams from service clubs.

Because if people come to us and want mentoring, we'd like to have a choice between a secular team and a faith-based team. But it's difficult. The most difficult part of our work is trying to get the mentors to commit to 1 year of mentoring these families.

And so without the motivation of the scriptures and the compassion that you have from your own faith to motivate you to do that, there's no reason on Earth for you to want to do that. There are so many disappointments. So many times that families make the wrong decision and don't progress, and so without your faith, you can't bring closure to those relationships.

Everything we do is relational. And that's a piece we bring to social services that isn't there now. The department here can provide so many resources to families.

They can provide avenues for education, for transportation, for childcare. And, yes, those are limited funds. But honestly, the people who really need them are getting them.

But what they can't provide is the coaching, the encouragement, and the nurturing that's required for some of these families who are so broken that they need that additional assistance to break the cycle of poverty in their lives.

And we don't just mentor the head of household. We mentor the entire family. So we have people that are mentors that are coming into the homes and tutoring two and three times a week a family, the children of these families, and helping the parents understand how structured study time helps to improve the skills of the children in school, and their ability to achieve academically.

So we're not ignoring the needs of the children. We match a mentoring team with the family. We examine and assess the entire family's needs, and then we link them to additional community resources that they may need, and we pour our lives into them. And then as a result, our faith and everything that we give is just deepened and returned back to us. I don't know if I answered your question or not.

Mr. SOUDER. Reverend Cowles, I had a—given that you've worked with a number of programs, and you're working with some of the Compassion Capital fund directly, one of the concerns I had as a sponsor of the faith-based amendments, and why I'm kind of backing up a little bit, is at one of our hearings in Washington, we went through a panel and said, "Would you take Federal funds?" And everybody expressed an interest. And it's on the public record.

The administrator in Indianapolis that was recommended by Steve Goldsmith, when the question came through, "Would you hire a Jew," since most of the members were Christian, Teen Challenge said no. A couple of others said no. They'd certainly service them, treat them well. They—just like an Orthodox Jewish organization wouldn't hire a Christian.

But the African American leader said, "Well, is that the only way I can get the money?" And he's one of the biggest churches.

Rev. COWLES. Eastern Star probably. Pastor Johnson.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, I guess there's a Judeo-Christian tradition. "Maybe I would if that's the only way I could get the money." And that prompted the question, "Would you hire a Muslim?" But basically those that didn't have a religious variable said no. Those that did say yes.

But when we ran into the question of whether they would even change their ministry in order to get the money, even if previously they didn't have those guidelines—which has been some of the fear some of us have had. "Even if currently not restricted, if we get the money now, will new regulations come in that will undermine it?"

Which leads to a second question. If you can take a few of these together, and Mr. Cote may have a response for this too. If the church is more integrated, which I actually believe is good, in the Black and Hispanic communities often more than in the White communities, therefore it's the only social entity left.

They don't control the local schools in the neighborhood. The only services left in the neighborhood are at the church. And if we exclude the churches, we, by definition, exclude the people that live

in that ZIP code often. We exclude the people that are delivering the services. Which is one of the reasons that we had a Capital Compassion fund, so we can tell how many 501(c)3 won't affect that church.

Would you describe some of what you're seeing, and how this changes things?

Rev. COWLES. It takes a long time to change what you've accepted. We're trying to train our folks that's not the environment anymore. Yes, the environment is you can't use those funds to pay Pastor Williams, but you can use those funds to hire Sister Williams to distribute food or do the after-school program that helps with tutoring, that doesn't have any religious proselytizing.

She's doing a good job for the community. You do have to have a separate board. The church board. A separate 501(c)3. And this is what JVC board is doing here in Colorado, to teach them how to set up systems and structures that don't compromise the church.

And in my written point I've said I don't know whether it's a curse or it's last rites. Because too many organizations have, you know, chased the money, and they've diluted their passion and vision, and consequently their outcomes have been compromised.

So, yes, it's changing, but it takes a long time to change those—it's like a quote I use in my book. It only took Moses 4 days to get the Hebrews out of Egypt. But it took 40 years while they were wandering to get Egypt out of the Hebrews. It takes a long time to understand there's a new day. There's a new way to do it that's a win-win for everybody.

Churches have to be careful. Don't compromise your position, and don't just accept money and change your policy. Because that dilutes who you really are. Mary Nelson in Chicago is a great example of that.

She took a little Lutheran church that was 100 years old that was dead, dead, and dying. Nobody else would come into that whole side of Chicago. And now it's Bethany Recycling Enterprises. And now it's doing the whole 9 yards through the faith-based organization. This with all the appropriate fire walls if you will.

We're urging people in our organization to continue to seek it appropriately.

Mr. SOUDER. This is mostly focused on domestic. We're just looking at the edges of this internationally. One came down in Central America as far as guidelines. But I want to followup on two things with you, Mr. Whetstone, and then I'll see who wants to make any kind of concluding comments here.

You mentioned in the—in your opening statement about the Denton amendment on international. And you were wondering would we be able to do that domestically.

Can you describe that? What would prohibit us from doing that domestically now?

Mr. WHETSTONE. A good example was when Hurricane Mitch struck Central America, the Denton Amendment provided that when the USAID declared a disaster somewhere in the world, the United States will help provide aid, and government resources can be used to transport commodities and assistance to those areas. We used government paid freight on ships to move containers of shelf-

stable milk and other nonperishable foods into Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

The Oklahoma National Guard has a fleet of C130's. Every day those planes fly training missions. Most of the time they go out with sandbags to simulate having cargo on them, so that the pilot can be used to what happens when you do this maneuver with cargo on it, as opposed to an empty airplane.

Obviously, they don't have to take military equipment every time they go up, but why couldn't they take assistance from Feed the Children in to Elkhart, IN, or into a small group or collection of churches in West Virginia, or to an Indian reservation in South Dakota? It's just basically the same concept.

You had spoken about the disposition of Federal property. That can be taken one step further in a program like the Denton amendment, where you could actually utilize government resources and government equipment and government property short-term for the need of that circumstance.

Mr. SOUDER. One of the things that I have figured out is that—maybe I was a little slow on the uptake. But as we moved from AIDS and homelessness into areas where there were existing groups that wanted the money, for example, drug treatment, there are very high-paid organizations that don't want any drug money to go to these little neighborhood-type groups. They're very worried about the competition. It's different than the other.

My sense—and I'd first like to lay this out to you and Mr. Anderson. When I recently spoke with Tony Hall about the world food question, he said in Ethiopia there was an organization out of my hometown, because a former Congressman had been an ambassador to Ethiopia. So there was a whole bunch of Ethiopians who had only heard of Fort Wayne, IN.

Through that, Senator Marah became involved. And she formed an organization down in Ethiopia for food distribution, which he said is the most effective program in that area that he had seen.

And one of the problems was when often the U.N. or the US tries to organize some disaster relief, or they try to distribute that food, the corruption level is incredible. The efficiency levels are a huge problem.

And part of the reason they started to turn to faith-based organizations in reaching out with this type of thing is that there is forum. For example, in Ethiopia, they were finding most of it stolen. Senator Marah said, "We've never distributed food before." The two people that the government had found guilty on stealing—she said she would do it, "Only on the condition that I can use them." And she included them in the organization, with accountability. Who later, by the way, after seeing the actions, I believe they then became Christians in the process, which was covert, not overt. Because they couldn't believe somebody forgave them and included them in the operations, and put a process in place.

What I want to know is OK, that's an Ethiopia story. Are you seeing this in other areas of the world where the Federal Government, the United Nations, and other entities are coming to your two organizations and saying, "Look, we're having problems with distribution"?

And it's one of the things we worry about in Congress. Because one of the reasons it's politically hard to do is people back home are saying, "Man, we've got a virus, and you're sending money over to Africa," and then they read somebody about putting a Swiss tanker down or stealing from it. It's a political nightmare. They weren't excited about it in the first place.

Can you elaborate a little bit about what you've seen in your two organizations?

Mr. ANDERSON. We've really experienced that most people are desperate, and even governments are desperate to find organizations that they can trust and rely on to have delivery mechanisms that are dependable. You have to work very hard to make sure that happens.

I think faith-based organizations, like Compassion, who are working for the local infrastructure of the church has a real advantage in that respect. Those organizations have value that many times are very against the culture that they live in, in terms of accepting bribes, accepting corruption as a part of their lifestyle. So no organization is immune from that. I'm sure everyone in this panel that you've listened to has experiences that are bad. But I would say the faith-based organizations probably have an advantage in that aspect.

And Compassion has developed a history of integrity, largely because of the partners we work with. We also put a lot of time and energy into auditing and quality control issues and training issues. Almost every one of our staff around the world are nationals. We don't put ex-pats out in the field and ask them to manage the programs.

And there are qualified nationals around the world who are faith-based individuals working with our organization who have high standards. And that's part of what we teach and train as we develop our partners around the world.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Whetstone.

Mr. WHETSTONE. That's exactly right. And it's not just limited to Africa. The former Soviet Union is probably even worse than our experiences in Kenya and South Africa. And you're right by providing our services through nationals.

We can provide so much more and we can avoid some of the problems in places like North Korea, where they need it worse now, because worldwide funding is drying up. That still doesn't mean millions of children aren't starving to death—we don't hear that story very often in America—because there is no aid for them.

One of the things that we experience is not just the corruption, but because those organizations are so big, like the World Food program and the United Nations—UN HCR and other organizations, is they can't respond quickly enough.

A real good example of that was right after Afghanistan hostilities broke out, millions of IDPs, internally displaced people, fled out of where conflict was going on into western Afghanistan, and out into the community of Herat.

In the Maslakh camp, the World Food program set up camps to house these people, to provide shelter and sanitation and food and that sort of thing. But they were arriving after several days of walking, carrying anything they could carry. Carrying children,

carrying infirm adults, carrying whatever possessions they could carry with them. And they got there after several days exhausted, and so many in even poorer health.

The U.N. wasn't equipped to handle 5,000 to 10,000 people a day. But at the same time, to ensure that we weren't helping enemy combatants and other people involved in the conflict, you had to be registered with the World Food program before you could get aid.

So what do you do with these people that are coming in 10,000 at a time? These little informal camps sprung up around the main camp of 500,000 IDPs. That's where we went in.

We recognized it immediately. We didn't try to take over what the World Food program was doing. We didn't try to change what they were doing. We didn't go in and cry, "You're not taking care of these people." We saw the need. We stepped in. We were flexible, and we ministered to them.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would add one more observation that you reminded me of, the anecdotal evidence that we've experienced in our organization. We began 50 years ago in South Korea during the Korean conflict. Many of our organizations started during that time, and many of them focused on South Korea.

We were able to focus on computers, advertising programs were used to program and manage the data. And today, South Korea is one of the largest economies in the world. And we're certainly not taking credit for that. But 25 plus percent profess to be evangelical Christian.

Compassion has been to North Korea several times, where faith has completely been eliminated as part of the equation in people's lives. It's not allowed at all. And the values and the corruption that has happened since those two countries have gone two different paths is quite a contrast. And I believe there's a lot to be learned from watching those two different decisions.

Mr. SOUDER. Have either of your organizations been in Iraq?

Mr. WHETSTONE. We're currently in Iraq.

Mr. ANDERSON. We're not.

Mr. SOUDER. Are you in Afghanistan?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. SOUDER. Have you expressed an interest in getting into either of those countries?

Mr. ANDERSON. We're really slow. We're not a relief and development organization. We're a long-term investment into individuals. So when we start somewhere, we're going to be there 20, 30 years. We follow the lives of children. So we're very slow to go into new countries. And the second factor is we partner with the local infrastructure and churches. And that has to be fairly well developed.

Mr. SOUDER. Is there anything more? One more question, Mr. Whetstone. Since we're heading over there and we're going to be meeting with the President and the former king, besides making them aware that you're there, do you have anything you want me to raise.

Mr. WHETSTONE. Again, Iraq is a very touchy situation right now, because it is hard to get in and do the relief work that's needed to be done. It's hard to get things across the border.

But anything that can be done to facilitate that through means other than just the United Nations would be appreciated. Because we're efficient and we're effective.

And I think that's really what the whole debate around the faith-based initiative ought to be. Who's effective and who's efficient.

Mr. SOUDER. It's interesting to add the international component, because it's very difficult in the United States. But when you go into a Muslim community with a Christian organization you have to say, "Look, the people wouldn't come here if they weren't Christian in their motive."

And trying to explain to Momar Khadafy that we're going to be able to do in 2 days what others couldn't do in months. Weapons of mass destruction are important, but there are other values. He's going to question Christian values and other things related to Israel, related to Christians, and what rights you have, women's rights in these countries, and how if they want our engagement beyond just minimal, and yet their culture is not going to change.

In eastern Europe, this is a huge question too with Orthodox, at least women. The Orthodox faith, the missionary church, they've been invited to Bulgaria, because they are interested in opening a hospital. But looking at the missionary church, some of those people might actually give somebody a Bible.

It doesn't mean that they push it hard. But it means in your own town, you now have evangelicals in your midst. These people are giving up their careers because they have a strong faith. So the limit is far more than just domestic. And we're playing it out on the domestic end.

Let me give you each, if you would like to take anything at the end of the concluding comments, and we'll go through again with Mr. Whetstone starting.

Mr. WHETSTONE. Again, just thank you for the opportunity to come here and bring these issues. I think, as the debate has shown today, there's a lot of difference of opinion. I think there's a lot of misunderstanding of what the faith-based initiative is all about.

At Feed the Children, we're a little bit different from most. However, we recognize the importance of that in the work that these organizations do. And we want to support that.

We recognize that the assistance that we provide is a simple, short-term assistance. And that doesn't change people's lives. Maybe the fact that we gave it to them might change their lives. And our example might change their lives to help break those bonds of poverty. But it takes more, and we want to support those churches and those rescue missions, and help them and enable them to do more with less.

Again, effectiveness and efficiency, regardless of how you accomplish those means. Again, if faith is involved, that shouldn't be a discriminator in accessing funds to do more for the poor, and to help eliminate the problem.

So that's our standpoint is to help us do more. And if we can do it more efficiently than the government, so be it. If we can't, let us fill those gaps. And if the government can assist with limited resources, so be it.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. Ms. Littrell.



Ms. LITRELL. I too appreciate the fact that you listened to us today, and hopefully the diverse input that you got will have some bearing on what goes on.

I would like to say that I basically think what we're all after is success in the work that we do. That we want to see that the people that come to us have the opportunity to go ahead and lead a middle class life, if that's what they choose.

And I don't think that there's any reason that a church can't do that work. The only thing that I would like to see is that the opportunity be there to do that without strings.

That people be offered services that feed them, that clothe them, that help them when they need medical attention. That when they have a tooth that needs to be pulled or whatever, that be done without strings.

That people that come there get the services that they need. If, in the meantime, they say, "Boy, I would really like to have religious direction," let that be offered. Let it be available for them.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Reverend Cowles.

Rev. COWLES. Well, again, thank you, like all the rest, for coming from Indiana, and welcome to our beautiful State.

And as a person that—our partners all across the Nation, they're mom and pop, and they don't get on the radar screen of anybody except the local community. And they are desperate for this kind of training, this kind of support. And they can do it well. They can do it efficiently.

And I guess my comment would be let's try it. I think as Bob said earlier, if it works, let's do it. Let's try it. Because for too long, these other programs and approaches haven't worked. We know that, and the populous knows that. That's why they're asking for change. That's why they're changing administrations. They want to change it. They want to open the doors.

And I think we need to look toward the business world in adopting a more competitive model. If it works, you get the contract. And if you can produce, great. It doesn't matter how you do it. If you can do it, it works. That's why businesses rise and fail. Some make better pasta than others and people go there.

So I think this is toward that end. I sense that this kind of initiative is getting there. To raise up, make a level playing field, everybody has equal opportunity to get to the resources. And if they can produce, then wonderful. And we'll all be better for it in the next 30 years.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Ms. Robinson?

Ms. ROBINSON. Of course, thank you very much for listening to us. And I think it's been a very interesting debate today. And I've learned a lot, I know, about international issues and things like that.

But I still will hope that the committee takes seriously the separation between church and State when they're making their final decisions. And, you know, it's hard. We have to think of our vulnerable population, and putting them in the hands of people who truly want to help them without strings attached.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you. I guess I would like to encourage you that true faith-based organizations are not going to be able to segregate their thinking and their organizations. If they can, they probably aren't faith-based. They're faith-based individuals, but not as an organization.

There's a Haitian proverb that says, "A hungry stomach has no ears." And I think all of us are here and recognize that people have needs, and we're here to meet those needs.

Some have faith-based programs and others have components in those programs.

I would encourage you not to have fear of propagating what might be a very efficient and effective organization.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Ms. Jaramillo.

Ms. JARAMILLO. Thank you very much for allowing us to testify today. And I just would probably say in closing comment that Faith Partners really organized a response. It was the faith community's response to welfare reform in our community, and that we became the poster child of charitable choice in our community.

It has been very difficult for us to continue getting help from our supporting churches. They'll give us volunteers, but it's very difficult for them to let go of some of the funds that they really should be giving us.

And I see that they need to shore that up in order for it to be a true partnership. I feel uncomfortable with being totally supported by a government contract. However, I'll get the work done however we can get the work done. And we outsource the work that we do.

I'm not mentoring families. It's the wonderful volunteers from those churches. And the work that we produce could not be done by the welfare department. And the effect that we have on families could not happen without our presence in their lives.

So we stepped out in faith and tested the waters of charitable choice, and we're still in testing that. And I don't think we're going to see results. We didn't get into this public policy issue overnight, and we're not going to get out of it overnight.

So in the wisdom of Mark Okasky, he says, "It's taken generations, decades since we ushered in the entitlement mentality with our social policy in this country. It's going to take decades for us to reverse that."

So those of us that are just brave enough to weather the storm are out there. And I don't know where this debate will end up, but I'm glad to be a player.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Mr. Cote.

Mr. COTE. I commend you, Congressman, and your staff for putting this together and having us here today. Step 13 will not accept Federal, State, or city moneys as long as I'm around. But I pray that you take a real, real hard look at these faith-based organizations, because I hope that they do get some money, a piece of the pie.

You know, try it and see what works and why, and go with it. That's what we need to do is start fixing people instead of just feeding them, and solving problems.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank you each for your testimony. My interest in this issue arose when one of my friends got elected to Congress, Dan Coates. And he became the senior Republican on the Children and Family Committee.

And we went to hearing after hearing on this problem, and it became clear to us that unless we could figure out how to get a broader base of support, other than just government, we weren't going to be able to deal with the social questions.

And I think there's wisdom in the words of Bob Woodson: "Don't be a typical White guy who sits on your duff. Get out and meet people."

I couldn't believe the story in San Antonio. And I've gone to see it, and I go back every few years and say, "Are you still here?" Kim Gray and Gene Watkins in Los Angeles, and Richard Guinness, and lots of grass roots organizations. Because even in the toughest areas of the United States, there are flowers blooming. And we need to figure out, "OK, how do we nurture those flowers?"

The debate will never end. I remember I met one guy in Newark who told me he was with International Harvest. "I came here to save New Jersey, and then to save south Newark, and then to save my community area, then this block, then this house, and now if I can just get to one kid," he said.

Because it's important what we're trying to do, and to reach people.

And I ran for Congress partly because of this issue. I believe in trying to resolve it. Not just with direct funding, but in this whole range of things. It's clearly important. And it's too easy to ignore those that have been unfortunate. And I've told this story multiple times. But Juan Rivera, who was part of Freddie's ministry, the first time I went down there, the first thing he said was, "Are you hot? Can you I get you some water?" He then said, "Can I tell you how I met Jesus?"

And I went into one housing area after another. And I met about 50 or 60 people working in homeless shelters who went through this same process, who had been addicts, and then later I met another group of 50, and then met another 100 later who went cold turkey, in some cases, off cocaine and heroin.

And I had just been at John Hopkins, where they said you couldn't do it. Look, there are multiple methods of doing wonderful work. Others are doing wonderful work. But for many people, the spiritual side is a critical component of a really huge transformation. How do we do that.

And I'm reminded of the days we were at this shelter where people were going through the drug rehab. And this was in part of San Antonio where American Beauty was based off of, the movie. They had one lonely tree in the back yard.

And Juan Rivera said, "After I got off of drugs, they gave me a Bible, and I started to read the Bible. And every time I come back here, it reminds me what transformed my life and how my life transformed. And I praise God every day."

And I said, "I feel so ungrateful because of what I've been given." And Juan said to me, "My dream is that someday my kids can be like you, and have the opportunities that you have. And that's my goal." And I said, "I feel so ashamed." And he said, "Well, you

should be ashamed. You're ungrateful." I said, "No, I'm unashamed." He said, "You should be ashamed. People who have been given much, much is expected."

And in trying to do that, and in trying to figure out how we can do this with our Constitutional provisions, how to do this with the fact that lots of Christians wouldn't want their tax dollars going to people that hit the mat and pray to Allah at 5 is a condition for getting sued.

This is not an easy matter to work through. And we're trying to work through it and yet say, "Look, there are not enough people who are focused on helping people who are in need. And we can't have these divisions and bitterness among us, because we're so few." And we're trying to work that through. And it's going to be very difficult to get anything done.

This year will be like this, but I'm hoping as we get through the election year, we can come back through and move some of these things, at least move in the executive branch.

Last statement. I feel compelled to say, and I'm sorry Mr. Tollefson is not here, but the National Day of Prayer is not funded by the Federal Government. It has not nothing to do with it. And Shirley Dobson and some other people formed that.

And they're required to have all kinds of people in it, because it's a private sector project that anybody can join from different programs. And you can argue about that, but it really wasn't relevant. And I didn't feel that was a fair statement to have in the record unresponded to.

And I also think Colorado Springs is a good place to come to have a public hearing. There is a lot of diversity in Colorado Springs, as you broach the different issues. And I wanted to put that on the record.

Thank you for taking time out of your busy day. And more importantly, thank you for each of your organizations working to help people who desperately need your help. And if you could express that to those people who are working back in your organizations, because without them, there would be people who would be both hungry and hurting and also need spiritual help too.

With that, the subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:16 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional information submitted for the hearing record follows:]

**The Colorado Foundation for Medical Care's Tepeyac Project:  
A Success Story in the Effort to Increase Mammograms Among Hispanic Women**

Founded in 1970, The Colorado Foundation for Medical Care (CFMC) is one of the most experienced and respected Medicare Quality Improvement Organizations (QIOs) in the United States. CFMC offers a variety of services to help its customers improve quality of care, contain health care costs, and ensure that health care dollars are spent on medically necessary and appropriate services.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) mandated that each QIO identify a population for which there was a health care disparity. When the Tepeyac Project started in 1999, there was a long-standing breast cancer screening disparity of at least 10 percent between Latinas and the general population of women in Colorado with Medicare. The disparity was even greater among elderly women, those at greatest risk for breast cancer. The aim of the project is to educate this underserved population about the benefits and safety of mammography in a culturally sensitive manner.

In 1999, CFMC convened a study group of Latino health and social service providers to gain greater insight into Colorado's Latina population and to identify community institutions and programs that could serve as partners. CFMC learned that 50-75 percent of Latinas report regular attendance at a Catholic church and that the church is an integral part of the Latina social network. After completing and analyzing its research findings, the non-profit made the decision to approach Colorado's three Catholic dioceses for their support.

After developing a strong partnership with Catholic churches throughout the state in 2000, the mammography rates for this targeted population increased from 45 percent to 52 percent. CFMC conducted focus groups of women in the churches to determine if in fact the church was a meaningful venue to distribute health-related information. The most impressive increase was in zip codes where health educators, known as *promotoras*, were doing outreach, one-on-one, with women in the parishes. In these "enhanced" communities, the mammography rate for Latinas with Medicare increased by as much as 16 percent.

There is still a gap to close between Latinas and the general population. To close this gap CFMC is building on lessons learned in the first phase of the program (1999-2002) and continuing its work with the churches. Women in Tepeyac Project focus groups reported that health information delivered in a church setting appeared more credible and they were more likely to act upon it (see other findings in the table on page 2). Based on this feedback, CFMC continued to pursue church involvement in the program. New mammography education and promotion materials were developed – in both Spanish and English - with extensive input from the promotoras and the target population. They were distributed, along with proposed bulletin and pulpit messages, to all Catholic churches. Nearly 80 percent of the churches indicated their willingness to make the materials available.

Additionally, CFMC partnered with the University of Colorado Health Care Policy & Research Division and Clínica Tepeyac, a small clinic that serves as a model for outreach, to assist with replicating the clinic's successful promotora program in other Colorado communities. Six church communities were recruited to develop more extensive breast health education programs, titled the Teach the Model Program, in their parishes. Volunteers, including Hispanic Ministry Coordinators, breast cancer survivors, and a nun, attended one-and-a-half day training sessions. These volunteers will continue to receive technical support for the next two years as they plan and implement strategies to reach women, one-on-one, promoting the importance of mammography in their church communities.

**Page 2**  
**CFMC Tepeyac Project**

For more information on the Colorado Foundation for Medical Care's Tepeyac Project, call Christine Dauchot at 303-695-3323.

**QUALITATIVE EVALUATION OF INTERVENTIONS: STATEWIDE FOCUS GROUPS HIGHLIGHTS**

Research Question	Highlights
Perceived role of Catholic Church as source of health information	Church is appropriate vehicle to deliver health information
	Church is convenient and accessible location, especially for women
	Information is delivered to Latinas and all their relatives and friends at the same time
	More trust in legitimacy of information because messengers at church are perceived as genuinely caring for the community
Church as catalyzing agent	Church should provide service in addition to information
	Latinas will respect and follow health-related recommendations from church
Which piece of intervention was more effective?	Trend toward more personal, direct, repetitive information delivery
	Church bulletin: effective if repetitively published
	Some effect from posters, many had seen it
	Pulpit announcements were more effective if coming from priest